DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 753 SP 010 807

AUTHOR	Oberteuffer, Delbert
TITLE	Concepts and Convictions.
INSTITUTION	American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	274p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AAHPER Publications-Sales, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($10.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Athletics; *Educational Philosophy; Health; *Health Education; Health Programs; Mental Health; *Physical Education; Physical Fitness; Physical Health; Sex Education; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This collection of speeches, papers, and essays divides into three sections: "Some Challenges Accepted," "School Health Education," and "Physical Education." The section on school health discusses such topics as: the school as a force for health; philosophy and principles of school health programs; health as motivation; sex education; appraisals of health education; health instruction; mental health of children; challenges for professionals; and guidelines for teacher preparation. The section on physical education covers: a holistic point of view for physical education; idealism and its meaning for physical education; the relation of principles to practice; physical education in higher education; learning from people's culture; administrative concepts; contributions of physical education to the educated life; the meaning of "education"; role of physical education in health and fitness; learning values from sport; discovery of personal values; the culture of sport; and physical education as a rich experience. (MM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED135753

CONCEPTS AND CONVICTIONS

Delbert Oberteuffer

Professor Emeritus, The Ohio State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A AHPER

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SP 010 807

AMERICAN ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION

COPYRIGHT © 1977

AMERICAN ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH,
PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION

Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission of the publisher. For information, address the Alliance, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Order from:
AAHPER Publications-Sales,
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20036

Contents

Introduction 5
Preface 7

Section One Some Challenges Accepted

The Study of Man as an Entity 11
Some Observations on the Challenge to Modern Education 14
The Relation Between Health Education and Physical Education 21
Thoughts for Commencement 28

Section Two School Health Education

Health and Education—An Appraisal I 33
Health and Education—An Appraisal II 48
The School as a Force for Health 63
Philosophy and Principles of the School Health Program 73
Health as Motivation 84
Some Things We Need and Some Things We Do Not Need in Sex Education 87
An Appraisal of Health Education in the Space Age 106
Health Instruction 115
The Mental Health of Children 122
A Challenge to the Professions 131
Guidelines for Teacher Preparation 140

Section Three Physical Education

A Holistic Point of View for Physical Education 147
Idealism and Its Meaning for Physical Education 161
The Relation of Principles to Practice 167
A Decalogue of Principles 178
Wherein Lies Significance? 184
An Armenian from Des Moines 190
Physical Education in Higher Education 203
We Learn from the Culture of People 209
Through the Looking Glass 213
Concepts of Administration 218
Some Contributions of Physical Education to an Educated Life 223
What is the Meaning of the Noun Education? 232
A Test for Educational Value 239
The Role of Physical Education in Health and Fitness 243
On Learning Values Through Sport 251
The Discovery of Personal Values 258
Physical Education As a Rich Experience 266
Does Sport Have a Culture of Its Own? 269

Introduction

It is my assumption that every profession is like ours in that each generation produces leaders who possess certain dynamic, charismatic qualities that cause them to rise above the rest of us professionals. My position in AAHPER has given me an opportunity to observe these leaders of my generation as they have attained recognition and stature as the acknowledged spokesmen for the profession. It has been my privilege to consider some of these individuals as both personal and professional friends.

One of the individuals who has gained and held my respect and admiration as a leader of my time is Dr. Delbert Oberteuffer. He has achieved recognition within the profession, as well as in the related areas of education and medicine, where he has expounded his concepts and convictions with such clarity and authority that one of lesser stature hardly dares challenge his position.

Dr. Oberteuffer possesses the rare combination of a keen, creative, sensitive mind, a silver tongue and dramatic flare, and a magic pen that makes it possible for him to communicate readily with individuals of various backgrounds. He has been widely sought as a speaker throughout his career and while all his ideas may not have been fully adopted by all groups, he has challenged many people to re-evaluate their own concepts and to review critically their convictions.

This volume of the Leaders Speak series should prove to be an historic treasure for any professional library. It may be the only book in the series that will tie together the related fields of health education and physical education.

Thank you, Obie, for sharing with us your concepts and convictions of a lifetime of reflection based on scholarly study and professional dedication.

George F. Anderson
Executive Director
American Alliance for Health, Physical
Education, and Recreation

Preface

When George Anderson, executive director of the American Alliance, asked me to gather some manuscripts I thought might be acceptable for a rereading, I had to go back many years and recall those moments during which I spoke my convictions dredged deep from a lifetime of dedication to the achievement of excellence in programs for both *physical education* and *health education*.

For I have been just as interested in one as in the other and tried to aid in the development of both. That meant a great deal of reading—and lots of writing—and, as it turned out, lots of speaking at meetings and conventions, institutes and workshops.

A sample of the distilled product is here presented.

Students in my classes, colleagues on the staff here at the Ohio State University, and above all, audiences have been immensely stimulating. As I look back over the manuscripts and the outlines of hundreds of speeches, I remember keenly the satisfying feeling of having done my best to fulfill the expectations placed upon me. In no instance did any audience or any class get less than my best. So I must be, and am, content with the judgment of time and memory.

Section One
Some Challenges Accepted

The Study of Man as an Entity

In the May 1951 issue of the *Record* there appeared a gratifying account of the establishment of The Ohio State University Social Science Research Council. Therein it is intended that considerable coordination of group and individual effort can be made as researchers explore further the nature of man and his relationship to the world he lives in. The Council will serve, we hope, as an important instrument for the stimulation of research and the dissemination of information.

With this step the University moves closer to its ultimate development as a cultural center. Eventually, it should be possible to unite all of the areas where man is a subject of study to the end that students will be the beneficiaries of instruction which will be rooted in broad wisdom rather than in the provincialism which happens to most of us at the moment. This large University is just the place to study man as he is—as an entity—as a unified being, with an emerging personality that is quite different from any presumed sum of his parts. We have dissected man. We know something of his physiology. We recognize his anatomical features. We understand that he has "emotions." Some things are known about his relationship to the physical world about him. But much of our knowledge of man is exploratory in the sense that we have probed into his original nature. What we need to know more about is the character of all these

---

Published in *The Graduate School Record* of The Ohio State University, Columbus, July 1951.

interrelated parts and functions *as they mesh together* to produce a living organism. And when we know more about that, we will be eager to know something of the predictable interactions of one living man on another as he forms his groups and cultures.

We wonder, for example, whether there can be such a thing as the physiology of international judgments. Could we ever throw light on the problem of racism by studying the conditioned relationship between color, vision, and pleasure? If children enter this world hostile to their new and unfriendly environment, as some think they do, and thereafter spend their lives in a struggle for security and mastery, can we arrive at any solutions to our social problems by extending liberally to all populations our current knowledge and services about disease, or nutrition, or any of the creature comforts we prize so highly? It becomes increasingly evident with each passing crisis in this troubled world that mankind is demanding a whole life, a full one in every sense of the word. He is discontented with a segmented existence. Food is not enough. Neither is a roof over his head. He wants it all—freedom, food, protection against disease, the right of self-determination, and security. He can no longer be dealt with on one level alone, whether it be the economic, the intellectual, or the physical, and this suggests strongly that there must emerge from the segmented disciplines of today a science of personality which will be identified not as social, or biological, or physical, or religious, but as all of these—a true science of man.

It seems inescapable that such a science will develop, and when it does we must bring not only the lawyer, religionist, sociologist, educator, and economist together, but we must hasten to unite them with the physicist, bacteriologist, and all other life scientists who can contribute to the understanding of man and his society.

Our great need today is for scholars who are wholly informed, who seek to synthesize knowledge from segmented specialties in order to bring it to bear upon man as a living whole. We need professors who are less inclined to retain their "academic" prejudices, less inclined to put an order of priority upon value in academia, less inclined to worship the old dichotomies of mind-body, arts-science, academic-nonacademic, intellectual-physical, or theoretical-pragmatic. We need chemists who respect sociologists, physicists who are interested in education, educationists who will learn from the physiologists and the humanists alike. We need scholars inclined to see man as a totality and not merely as a creature to be analyzed from one viewpoint alone. We need maturity not sophistry, breadth not provincialism, in all of our fields of learning.

Under these improved conditions we could direct the power of our University toward what Angyal and Dunbar and Williams and others have been encouraging, namely, the study of the human being as a whole. We could offer the world a university of scholars living in mutual respect because each would demand of the other not isolated contributions but, in addition, a demonstration of a willingness to seek an interpretation of the relation of such contributions to the integrated life.

And so the Social Science Research Council looks like a good thing. It should grow into a relation with a physical science council, a biological science council, a council for research in arts. If we were bold enough to take two steps at a time, we would form an organization now designed to study man as a whole—an organization with funds, publications, meetings, seminars, planning groups, all the devices of intergroup communication.

Such a Council would give universality to the University. Properly conducted it would bring us all—humanist, artist, scientist, educationist, administrator—into a more realistic rapport. We would have a better conception of what each has to give. The regrettable ignorance many of us now have regarding others would, we hope, slowly leave us. We could no longer enjoy the luxury of our current feelings of superiority. They would be superseded by appreciations. The University in general, and the Graduate School in particular, would become institutions wherein students would study man as he lives and not mere segments of his existence. We would have to alter some of our contemporary notions of "specialization" and allow students a broad sweep in their electives. Such an extension of present practice in study, research, and teaching is not impossible to attain. It is surely a development of the future, and when such an effort can actually be made, when scholars share respect as well as ideas, then we will become truly a great University.

Some Observations on the Challenge to Modern Education

No serious student of education can fail to be concerned about today's epidemic of critical commentary visited upon our schools. It comes from both the informed and the uninformed, the sincere and the capricious. Scientists, politicians, college presidents, ministers, admirals, industrialists, and press editorial writers are all in the act. The professional educator is getting more than enough advice as everyone seems to be searching frantically for a scapegoat for the deficiencies found in our present social, economic, industrial structures. Anyone who can find an audience is ready to "cry havoc," and whether the opinion is expert or inexpert, if it is critical of American education, it will find its way into print or be heard on the airwaves.

It is quite enough to test the patience of those among us who are deeply respectful of facts. One by one we read the recent record. There is a leading rocket expert, decorated a few years ago by the head of the German government for his development of the deadly V2 rocket, who once told a Congressional group that the teaching of values and ethics has no place in the public schools! There is the genius of the atomic submarine who used the forum of a college campus to deplore what he called wasted school time spent preparing children for living instead of "collecting factual knowledge to the limit of their absorptive capacity." He scathingly attacks the greatest American philosopher, John Dewey, whom he holds responsible for our current efforts toward educating for "life adjustment."

Delivered at Eastern Michigan State College, Ypsilanti, April 29, 1958.

Writing in *The Atlantic*, an English critic inveighs heavily against our modern program aimed at the development and protection of the health of children by advising that all of health education and safety education is "an impertinent invasion of the prerogatives of parents" and the school could do well to be rid of the whole business. In *Harper's*, the Easy Chair bitterly makes fun of "Little Willie Jukes" who is taught "life adjustment" by learning to dance, play a clarinet, and drive a car safely.

A great physicist unburdened himself of a dedicatory speech in which he deplored many aspects of today's education. He implied that school playgrounds are luxuries and that when he was a boy a walk to and from school was adequate physical education! He confesses to making the debate team in high school but seems to be glad there was little interscholastic athletics. He deplores the introduction of what he and the admiral call snap or trivial courses and believes that athletic contests and their "carnival atmosphere" should be sharply reduced in importance. Particularly does he lament that the serious student is ridiculed by being called a "grind" or an "egghead."

Now, one dislikes to be picayunish about such blasts from very great scientists, but one can tolerate such remarks only so long without making some counter comment.

If bright students, "eggheads," are ridiculed (and I seriously doubt they are in most schools and colleges) would it be because their predecessors of an older generation, products of such adjustment-free schooling of 30 years ago, have set the pattern for eccentricity that invites nonacceptance? Or would it be that our teachers of 30 years ago, when times were "tough" and not "soft," forgot to help us develop a respect either for excellence or for individuality, and thus the children of the people who are now parents have been brought up poorly in that respect?

The evidence for the physicist's diatribe seemed to come from his own experience and those of his children and two brothers-in-law! And *this* is the scientific method? Can we be led to believe the criticisms are valid upon such a trifling sample? It is truly a good thing that biological scientists draw conclusions on more substantial grounds, else medicine would be charlantanism indeed!

No one in education resents informed, intelligent, and constructive criticism. The National Association of Secondary School Principals suggests that "the person who points an accusation at secondary schools ought to know what he's talking about." He should have an acquaintance with "practice and quantitative data pertaining to schools. Furthermore, he ought to tell why his criticism is valid and pinpoint some realistic ways by which schools may work suggested improvements into the educational bloodstream. Above all, he should be in possession of the facts, as revealed by reputable research findings. If the critic does none of these things, his words cannot be presumed to be constructive. He merely carries the ball in a game that has no playing field and no rules."

When one consults the record of achievement by our modern schools and colleges, when one examines a person's needs and requirements, when one takes the trouble to learn something of the biological and psychological interdependencies and interrelatedness which characterize the entity that is a human being, one can only be amazed—and disappointed—at the kind of criticism now current.

It is a kind of intellectual anti-intellectualism. It is the informed person not being informed enough. It is the expert not knowing the origin of his or her expertness nor the conditions under which expertness is developed. The intellectual belies intellectualism by displaying an ignorance of human nature through a wish to perpetuate the mind-body dichotomy. There is no surer delusion than to believe that intellect can be developed in "tough" courses, and alone, while proposing that the "social" and "physical" aspects of youth be deliberately left out of a reformed curriculum. Such a position defeats the very purpose of the critic and, if followed to its ultimate conclusion, would bring the whole structure of this spurious intellectualism crashing down around us in a chaos of frustrations, nervous breakdowns, and maladjustments. There is no surer fact in all of life than the dependency of the intellectual processes upon the organic for their functional adequacy or efficiency. The human being feeds on something vastly more complex than reactor fuel, and if survival is the goal, we had better provide this nourishment in both school and home.

Let's look into this a little further.

Let's have a look at a course in "life adjustment." Have these critics ever seen one? I'll bet not. I looked into one the other day. It is currently used in the Chicago Public High Schools. It outlines work for all four high school years. It deals with such subjects as individual and community efforts at preventing disease; a study of control measures for cancer, tuberculosis, and polio; problems of emergency health care; the selection of physicians; the use of dental and medical examinations; nutritional needs, worries, fears, and anxieties and how to deal with them; getting along with teachers and classmates; the need for active recreation; and a host of other subjects, each one accompanied by ample study from textbooks and other resources.

How could anyone consider such material to be trivial, inconsequential, or an "impertinent invasion of the prerogatives of the home"? One might as well expect the home to teach the essence of the quantum theory as to deal with recent advances in immunology or mental health, as many of these life adjustment courses do! Without the transmission of these segments of our scientific and cultural advance we would soon slip into a 20th century darkness, exposed to the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse once again, with disease and pestilence in the form of polio and venereal disease riding roughshod over us!

Furthermore, if we want an intensive program for the production of physical scientists we had better pay some sharp attention to the growth patterns and the interrelated psychic states of these youngsters we are about to teach, else they may not be able to make it. The rate of breakdowns, psychological disturbance, emotional unrest, suicide, and marital unhappiness is high among our intelligentsia. There simply is no evidence at all to support the opinion that children need no guidance in life adjustment. How can any self-respecting scientist in any field ignore the revelations from the clinic, the court, the church, and the school from which comes a flood of information about the needs and problems of the disturbed adolescent? It is nonsense to believe that knowledge alone will provide the skills for life adjustment or that the school can blithely withdraw its interest in helping its clientele find ways to meet the tensions and problems caused by humanity seeking a way to deal with the weapons the scientist has helped produce!

And physical education. Call it a trivial course if you will, decry the alleged absence of intellectual content in it, deplore its prominence and popularity, but physical education is here to stay. Not because a "lobby" is forcing its attention upon schools, not because modern schools seek entertainment as well as scholarship, nor because we seek to give lip service to the old saw about the sound mind in the sound body. No, physical education is here to stay because the truly informed person knows that youth develops as a psychophysical entity, that growth and development of any part is related to growth and development of the whole. When you come right down to it, if you want to have active, creative cells in the brain or anywhere else, *activity of the total organism is a requisite*. It may be hard for some of our intellectuals to accept, but there is no question of the value of exercise, of vigorous activities for young and old alike. Because of what we know of these psychosomatic relationships, a good program of physical education aims to provide the skills that will make possible continuous participation for life as well as lessons in personal and group adjustment that will need no apology from anyone.

Strange indeed is the sound of the scientist arguing against competitive athletics or the broader field of physical education for all as a part of education. It is strange *because of the part the scientist is playing in emphasizing the need for physical education*. Automation, the machine, the great array of mechanical devices make less and less the need for muscular activity. The power mower and the automatic dishwasher, developed by scientists, engineers, and other technologists, are changing our way of life—but they have not changed nor will they change our *requirements* for living. Organically, physiologically, we still have, in spite of electric eyes, automatic card-shufflers, and airplanes the same physiological needs which are answered, in part, only through exercise and muscular activity. Physical activity is a basic requirement for successful and productive living. How, then, can any scientist who creates the machines decry the education that will save man from deterioration because he uses the machines?

The truly informed person, the one who has bothered to read a book on the subject, would not dare to confuse physical education with a simple walk to and from school or make the embarrassing revelation of his own ignorance, as a college president did to me once, when he proudly boasted that he "got all his physical education milking cows on the farm."

The education of the young through the experiences from play; from games, sport, and dance; from the gymnasium, the playing field, and the ski run; from the swimming pool and the trail is expensive, but it is of the essence. The Greeks knew it. Biological scientists know it. Physicians know it. Modern cardiologists know it. Nearly everybody knows it and knows that if American education is to be devoted to the cultivation of the liberally educated and soundly developed citizen, physical education would be one of the *last* things removed from such a developmental program. There is no alternative. Remove this kind of experience from the curriculum and who will supply it?

Why do some people delight so in their barbed remarks about high school athletics, college halfbacks, and competive sport in general? It puzzles me! Could it be that the critics feel a deep personal inadequacy or are somewhat jealous of the popularity of the athlete? Athletics is a convenient scapegoat! If one wishes to be constructive on this point, one would admit that there are excesses in athletics—exorbitant salaries at some "big-time" colleges, undue publicity, celebrational banquets, extraordinary expenditures. These things give athletics a bad name. But the cure is to reduce those things in size and quantity, not to eliminate physical education and its prominent offshoot, competitive athletics, from the educational scene.

It simply is not possible to live in the rarified atmosphere of the intellect alone, to cultivate it and it alone, to put all of our chips on the development of great intelligence in physics and mathematics and history, important as these are, and to ignore all the essential lessons we have learned through the ages relative to the unity of the person. It is not possible to ignore the importance of the biological, the importance of living in accordance with nature's plan.

To think so is all a part of a great delusion. There can be nothing more important than to see life as it is and construct an educational program in light of the facts. A person's needs of all kinds—cultural, biological, economic, emotional—must be ministered to for the person to grow up whole and in one piece. This is not just a matter of choosing or not choosing a few things to put into the school day. The educator looks at the person's nature, needs, and society and provides for them. Health education, physical education, and recreation, in spite of some current weaknesses and excesses, are an integral and essential part of the education of American youth because they meet youth's needs.

One wonders whether we must again go through the pain of choosing between the narrow and unrealistic, and the broad and realistic, concept of the nature and purposes of education. The narrow view holds that education should be designed to train the mind and the mind alone—as if that were ontogenetically possible! It holds that the "mind" is "trained" only through certain traditionally "academic" disciplines and that these are mathematics, science, history, and philosophy. It holds that these, and none other, are potentially capable of producing intellectual power and that intellectual power alone will save this nation from desuetude and disaster. This view is not unknown to the intelligentsia of the American liberal arts college nor to the products of an astigmatic scientific training. It is the darling of those who believe a person can be divided and all the rest separated from the intellect which can be cultivated in its own educational vacuum. It denies through its own ignorance the very things that make us secure in a democratic culture of agreeable persons.

The broad view believes that the primary purpose of education is to aid young men and women in their preparation for effective living in a free society. Not one word of this statement of purpose is inconsequential. To achieve this purpose the broad view would have us construct a curriculum of widely varying experiences, *each demanding excellence of performance in accordance with its own inherent standards,* and the curriculum as a whole recognizing the wide divergence of individual need, aptitude, and capacity. The broad view does not deny the importance of intellectual power, but it seeks to cultivate it within a human being who lives not by brains alone but by and through the aggregate of *all* of his or her powers.

Fortunately many prominent persons in our contemporary society are expressing this, the holistic, or broad view of humanity and the responsibility education has to meet its needs. We are passing through a period of critical analysis—and this is good. Critics are having their field day—and this also is good. If it does a physicist or a naval officer good to call the American system of education "rotten" at a press conference, then he probably feels better! Out of this period will come progress and improvement. The system has never been static. But the super-critic of the day should know that "we in America will stick fiercely to the central objective of our society—the *fullest* development of each individual as a free human spirit, not as a servant of the state."

The Relation Between Health Education and Physical Education

School health education and physical education have often been thought of as the same thing. While they do have many important similarities, there are enough differences to warrant their recognition as two aspects of a total educational program. They share a common goal—the development of health—but they are divergent. Physical education is also concerned with cultivation of leisure skills and social orientation necessary for preserving the techniques of democratic living. Only if the latter two are thought of as related to a very broad concept of health can the whole of the aim of physical education be thought of as "health building."

In materials and technique they are more different than alike. Physical education uses as its principal media of expression games, sports, and dances. Its ends are achieved by and through an immediate participation in the socially old movements. In school health education the processes are acquisition of knowledge about living healthfully and immediate participation in healthful practice. The one uses almost exclusively motor expression and the behavioral reactions inherent in the movements as they are organized into a recognizable game or dance. The other relies mainly upon the acquisition of knowledge for current or later use and certain health activities practiced now for protection or development. There is much in common but there are also important differences.

Adapted from "Relationships with Physical Education," in *School Health Education*, 3d ed. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 490.

The differences should be well understood. Neither discipline should receive credit for the success or blame for the failures of the other. There is plenty of reason for adequate praise of both for their respective accomplishments and some justification for criticism of each field as it fails to meet the needs of children. In a modern and fully developed educational program there is room for both to exist side by side and in harmony without serious infringement upon each other's province.

For example, physical education has been held accountable for the seemingly alarming number of rejections of men from service in World War II. Critics have said that better results should have been forthcoming after 25 years of compulsory physical education in shools and colleges. Such criticism is unwarranted and illogical for the following reasons: (a) The bases for the vast majority of rejections (sight, hearing, hernia, teeth, disease, illiteracy, psychological abnormalities, nutrition, orthopedics) had nothing whatsoever to do with a program of physical education. They would have existed with or without an activity program. (b) Those causes of rejection could also be found in the same persons ten years earlier, and failure to remedy the correctible ones can be laid to inadequate correlation between school appraisal services and home and community corrective or reparative efforts. (c) Many of these disabilities are the by-products of imperfect genetic matching and would appear under any circumstances short of mating on a gentically scientific basis. (d) The methods used to discover disabilities during World War II were more searching than in former wars; hence, more handicaps were found. (e) Where musculoskeletal disabilities were found, particularly muscular weakness, there may have been some liability on the part of physical education. But until school organization permits an hour of activity every day throughout the 12 years of school life (in 1944 it was shown by the U.S. Office of Education that less than half the people in twelfth grade throughout the nation had any physical education), one can hardly hold physical education accountable as a bulwark against the softening influence of a machine age.

On the other hand, the program of play and sports has infinite and unexplored possibilities in the area of mental and social development. Its potential effect upon muscular strength is obvious. In the psychological and social field the contribution is real but as yet unexplored and uncharted. These latter contributions of physical education may, in time to come, be seen as of greater significance by far than the effect on organic development, important though that is.

To be fair, we must recognize school health education for its contribution to growth and development through the extension of its services and its instruction. No one, particularly in physical education, should assume that muscular strength or skill alone is sufficient to produce an abundance of good health.

Those who seek physical fitness only through the activities of the gymnasium and playfield are not only chasing a nonexistent rainbow but ascribing far too much glory to the benefits of muscular exercise. There is no such thing as "physical" fitness, and if there were, muscular development alone would not produce it. The other aspects of living—nutrition, mental health, sexual adjustment, immunities—have an even greater bearing in the aggregate than does the muscular strength that may be produced from a program of physical education. If, however, school health education is not well developed, if there is no physician serving the school, no appraisal program, no disease control or emergency care plan, no instruction in healthful living, no coordination with community services in health, then school health education is severely deficient and the children are profiting only from whatever sport program there may be developed in the school.

Thus it may be seen that, although alike in some respects, the media and techniques of the two fields are different. There is no justification for the development of one at the cost of the other. Both are of great significance in child life.

In personnel, the two fields have much in common. There has not yet appeared a very large professional group devoted to school health instruction and known as school health educators. There are history teachers, chemistry teachers, biological scientists, but no large group of health teachers. Aside from the important group of physicians and nurses now in the school health field, the development of school health education—particularly the instructional phases of it—has been the responsibility of physical education personnel. Early in this century, when school administrators looked around for personnel to develop school health education programs of instruction and service, they found a very limited number of physicians and nurses, but in nearly every school there was someone teaching physical education. That person, prepared or not, had to develop much of the school health education program. The result of this alliance has been a widespread although qualitatively spotty development of health education in schools and colleges.

Today hundreds of colleges and universities prepare physical education teachers in both health education and physical education. They are striving to meet the demand from schools in health education. Until the time comes when there will be specially prepared personnel in school health education supplemented by an adequate supply of school physicians and nurses, home economists and biologists, psychologists and dentists, physical education teachers will have to remain in the "carrying" position. Their opportunity is great; ordinarily their enthusiasm is adequate; their training for school health education could be improved.

Health education and physical education use, then, in more instances than not, the same personnel. Physicians make good contributions to both fields, as do nurses. Teachers are needed in both, and physical education teachers can be competent in health education as well as in physical education. There is no organic reason why programs of health instruction, health service, and physical education cannot be wholly developed and integrated in harmonious relationship for the ultimate good of the student. Neither personal differences nor professional jealousies should be allowed to interfere with such a development.

The possibilities and limitations of a school program of physical education in regard to personal health should be well understood. Because of the great popularity of modern physical education, particularly the intramural and interschool athletic programs, schools have an exceptional opportunity to make a contribution to the health of the participants—and, of course, also an opportunity to detract from it. Whether the activity program is an asset or a liability depends upon its administration. The adults in charge—the principal, superintendent, physical education teacher, coach, medical adviser—are in the key positions to make of physical education, including athletics, a fine experience for growth and development or an experience of harm.

Fundamentally, physical education is a multi-objective field. The entire complex organization of varied activities seeks to contribute (a) to the social orientation of children, (b) to psychological integration, and (c) to organic strength and power. In a broad sense the attainment of these objectives would have a bearing upon the health of the individual. Certainly a program that, mindful of its first objective, seeks harmony between persons and groups, seeks to teach the techniques of intragroup behavior as basic to living successfully in a democracy, or strives to give meaning to the basic common concepts of fair play and honesty has a bearing on health. Or, in quest of its second objective, if it seeks through play activities to provide each child with experience of success, of identification with a group, of extroversion and objectiveness, or to assure the elemental pleasures of fun and deep-rooted satisfactions that come from being active kinesthetically, then physical education basically comes even closer to an attainable relationship with health. Its third objective, organic strength and power, is, of course, clearly basic to health. The attainment of these is a matter of program building, administrative and teaching practice, and personnel relationships.

Experience shows that the best results in terms of the health of participants will accrue if the following elements are present in the program:

1. *All* students in school and college receive instruction every year in physical education activities.

2. Students are provided a wide variety of activities chosen in relation to the age, sex, and need of the students, ranging through the entire gamut of rhythms, games, aquatics, sports, stunts, camping, and outdoor activities and not limited to a few popular ones like basketball and football.
3. Students are classified for participation by using a medical examination (or its best substitute) as a means of selection.
4. A program of emergency and accident care is in operation at all times.
5. Highly competitive sport (e.g., interscholastic athletics) is reserved for boys and girls of the upper four years of secondary school and is not superimposed upon younger children whose organic development and emotional maturity are incapable of carrying the burden of a competitive season successfully.
6. Boxing is restricted to instruction only and head blows and bouts are eliminated in the school program.
7. The best of training and conditioning practices are used for the interschool and intramural competitive leagues.
8. Injured players receive early and adequate medical care.
9. Participation during menstruation is limited to those who are approved for it medically.
10. The atmosphere of the physical education class is one of pleasure rather than grimness, creative expression rather than imitation, objectivity rather than inward subjectivity and introversion, success rather than failure, informality rather than formal discipline, "like" rather than "dislike." If children enjoy and look forward to their physical education period rather than try to avoid "taking gym," health values have a greater chance of development.

In a curricular sense there may be a high correlation between physical education and health education. The physical education teacher is confronted on all sides with opportunities to teach health, and students cannot attend a single physical education class without having some experience bearing upon their health. The important thing for the teacher to secure is the *best* in correlation and experience. Correlation opportunities (adapted from *The Contribution of the Physical Education Program to the Health Education at University School*, The Ohio State University, Dept. of University Schools, 1946) appear in the following areas:

1. The development of intelligent practice and understandings concerning infection, cleanliness, bathing, clothing.
2. The development of an understanding of the need for and skill in physical activity as a means of developing organic and psychological strengths.
3. The experience of understanding competent medical practice and first-aid care.
4. An understanding of safety practice and precaution.

5. Experience in emotional control, control of temper and language, and self-direction in the expenditure of enthusiasms and energy.
6. An understanding of the need and time for rest, the origins of fatigue, and the relation of fatigue to infection.
7. An understanding of diet, conditioning, fads and fallacies in athletic training.
8. A comprehension of the existence and meaning of individual differences in endocrine, cardiac, and other organic functions.
9. Experience in the psychological states of achievement, failure, envy, unselfishness, gratitude, sharing, identification, personal appraisal, independence, security, and self-reliance.
10. Experience and understanding of the sex role in life, including sex differences, boy-girl relationships, shared interests.
11. An appreciation of play and recreation in life, the value of winning, the lasting values, the continuous participation in recreational activities, self-imposed limitations.

These elements are teachable both by discussion and by laboratory experience. Their achievement would illustrate a high correlation between health education and physical education.

The physical education teacher, often the inspiration and the catalyst of a school health and physical education program, must be extraordinarily observant of the prerogatives of others and the limitations of his own training and abilities. To work successfully within the complex structure of school health education requires patience, tact, and modesty, and the physical education teacher must cultivate these in good measure. The public is likely to think of the physical education teacher who is "the coach of the team" as the principal figure in the health program. Athletics loom large in the public eye, and thus there may be some distortion of value between physical education and health education. To avoid this, all concerned must work in clear relationships with complete and frank understandings and, above all, with mutual respect.

To achieve this harmony in relationships the physical education teacher should—

1. Under no circumstances make a diagnosis of a disease, ailment, or injury.
2. Never usurp any function of therapy or treatment normally belonging to physicians.
3. Acknowledge that in matters pertaining to the participation of the disabled or handicapped in specific activities the medical judgment is the better and final one.

4. Abandon all pretense of mass corrective exercises given without benefit of a differential diagnosis on individual cases, and realize that such "shotgun" corrective techniques are outmoded and unscientific.
5. Abide strictly by properly constituted medical judgment in regard to the participation of athletes in interschool sport.
6. Never seek to play one physician against another for the sake of making a player eligible because of a difference of opinion. The authority for determining eligibility as it relates to condition should be vested in one person, and the judgment of that person should be inviolable.

Likewise, and in return, the physician should—

1. Be entirely familiar with the purposes and nature of the physical education program and understand its flexibility as regards adaptations to individual needs.
2. Suggest no permanent "excuses" from physical education but refer the handicapped student with, if need be, a recommendation for temporary inactivity and recommendation as to the kind of activity the pupil-patient might successfully undertake.
3. Serve as a consultant on the scientific accuracy of teaching materials in health instruction but not as a determiner of technique of presentation or curriculum organization unless particularly qualified to do so.
4. Make the periodic examinations of children for physical education or for athletic competition experiences of worth and examples of the best in medical appraisal.

Thoughts for Commencement

Has the notion caught on that the greatest of all truths in our democratic scheme of things is that all men are endowed by the Creator with equal and inalienable rights? Your education here has tried to help you understand the moral worth of *all* people, to understand something of the great dignity of the human being, and to respect and honor the other person because he—like you—stands as a citizen of our nation and of the world.

You will need this understanding. It will come in handy as you rub elbows with others less skilled in appreciating the other person's point of view. You will be tempted, as many are, to cast your lot with an unthinking and ruthless group willing to crush all others who dissent, eager to give way to their fears by reliance upon force or bombast instead of intelligence and reason, in which tradition you have been prepared. You will be tempted to succumb to all those demoralizing and immoral prejudices of racial and religious bigotry. You will be shocked to discover how easy it is to believe in the narrow doctrines of class or group superiority. Your challenge, in the face of all that, is to remain humane, sensitive to people, to human values, and to human aspirations, so that no matter how great a scholar you may later become, or how successful as homemaker, businessman, or scientist, you will remain humane—as warm and sympathetic and friendly as you are now.

Adopted from a commencement address delivered at University School, Columbus, Ohio, June 1955.

You have been brought up in a tradition where thinking has been welcome. You have not been subjected to the grand larceny of having your right to think stolen from you. You have been invited to think, to reason, to seek evidence, to weigh values, to be less gullible, less easily taken in, and more skeptical. You are experienced in being analytical. You have sought truth.

But the real test begins now. Now you will leave this atmosphere and go elsewhere on your own. And beginning now it will be interesting to watch you to see whether you continue your intellectual development to its fullest maturity, or whether you backslide and become a dullard. As Gilbert Highet reminds us:

> Individually, many people throughout the world are simply lazy. The bright, adventurous intelligence which they enjoyed in their youth is allowed to lie virtually unused for the rest of their years, covered over with the sediment of routine, rusted by the constant drip of casual gossip, clogged by meaningless chatter from newspaper and television, employed only on daily problems and the incessant re-examination of personal reminiscences.

One can express a fervent hope that from this moment you will continue to be alive intellectually; that you will continue to read, to explore, to study; that the curiosity you have shown so far will be insatiable; that new and bright things will always be attractive to you. One can hope that new ideas will not frighten you and that as the years roll by, you will revere old ideas or old ways of doing things only because they are still good and not because they are old.

You have been brought up in a tradition of creativity. You have valued creative experience. You have had a rich preparation, many of you, in the arts, in music and painting and dance. And you have shown that commendable characteristic—the ability to appreciate the other person's efforts in the creative arts. Your talent shows, your concerts, your festivals, your dances, and your literary outlets have given you the chance to be respectful and admiring of what wonders your classmates have wrought. So far you seem to have avoided that narrow specialized mind that walls itself in and excludes all suggestion that there is value or beauty or worth in what someone else does. Your artists, your writers, athletes, musicians, scientists have been enthusiastically received and sympathetically understood. You seem to have known what they were trying to do.

This appreciation means, if you keep it up, that you will escape what Canon Bell describes as the general boredom of the day caused by the absence of any appreciation of the ingredients of the good life. You seem to realize the truth of the old saying that variety is the spice of life. And only by being widely versed—knowing something of the great composers, thoughtful with the great philosophers and writers, open-minded and investigative with the scientist, informed, well-read, and provocative—can you be assured of a beautiful life filled with interest and excitement. Your task continues to be to cultivate discrimination between the good and the beautiful and the cheap and the shoddy.

And, last, you have been brought up in the tradition of friendship. There is a song in which they sing that "no man stands alone—no man is an island." Yours has been a friendly class, friendship based on respect, on admiration perhaps. Preserve it well, if it is there. You will need it. You will need to count on your friends—and they are all around you. Your tradition will not tolerate that you alienate these friends. Differ from them? Yes. You have differed before, and you will differ again, but do not let that get in your way of preserving these friendships. Look around you now. Get a good look at these people who have come through with you to this commencement day. They are your friends. They have helped you, and they will help you again. And you will be ready to do your share for them as the individual members of this class make your contribution to this world. No man stands alone, and the greatest thing you can do is to dedicate a great share of your life to making your friends happy.

Section Two
School Health Education

Health and Education — An Appraisal I

The development of the integrated relationship between health and education—so vital to both—is a slow, and often frustrating, process. Informed people have been saying for a long time that there is a very real and definable relation between the two, which makes the contribution of each an absolute necessity to the effective development of the other. There is a mutuality of good, a dependence one upon the other which, though ignored by some, is there nevertheless and is, in the long run, inescapable.

In simple terms, this relationship implies that one needs to be educated in order to develop and protect one's health, and one needs abundant health to make full use of one's education. It is a reciprocal, and actual, relationship.

This being so, why then, in this land of literate people, do we have so much ignorance about health, so much wastage of human potential, so much preventable distress, so few who live to their fullest capacity? Why, when one examines the curriculums and requirements in our educational structure, do we find so little attention given to education in and about health?

There is one general answer to both questions. Educators have not as yet fully understood the situation, so they have not as yet constructed the educational program to give full play to this reciprocal relationship.

Adapted from a paper given at the Ninth National Conference on Physicians and Schools, sponsored by the American Medical Association, Chicago, October 10, 1963.

Let's examine this. (But let me say at the outset that the case presented must be fragmentary, with scant documentation and colored largely by my own personal views. My credentials in health education in particular and education in general must sustain, for the most part, the positions taken.)

Man has forever sought the answers to the riddles of his existence. He has never been content to be baffled or misinformed. He has speculated when he had no proof, philosophized when he thought he saw light, experimented when he could. He has analyzed and probed, and he has learned from clinical experience. He has sought to explain the phenomena inherent in birth, life, and death. He has never been satisfied with the unknown or the uncertain.

There always have been those in his community who have sought the truth, and step by step, they have made the truth available for those who would or could use it. As a result, he has built up a considerable body of knowledge about himself which today amounts to some fraction of what he someday will know. The books are filled with the work of those scientists who have enlightened us in one way or another about human life. The detail of their findings is intricate. The weight of its importance is massive, the utility of the results vital to the development and survival of the human race.

But people do not learn about these findings by chance. One would never get the full flavor of them, or know how to use them, if one waited for their importance or meaning to drop out of the sky. Someone has to tell the story, to organize it in tellable shape, and to find the audience willing to listen and act upon the conclusions. What good the significant work of Bauer, Hudson, and Stokes on yellow fever if no one paid attention to their findings? Of what use would be the discovery of antibiotics if neither physician nor patient knew of them or how to use them? The world of science, particularly of the biological sciences, is a fascinating, useful, and ever-changing world. But it remains unappreciated until and unless we learn about it through experience, vicariously or as a participant. If the scientist in biology has something to say, if the physician has come upon something he wants others to know about, if mortality from cancer among women can be reduced if women will do something or other, then somehow, some way, people must be taught these things. We will never get the full benefit of scientific discovery until society demands that its educational program rises to meet the need—and the opportunity. There is no other way. The transmission of knowledge and understanding requires teaching.

This all seems so obvious—but it is at this point that the simplicity of the story ends.

Suppose we all agree that it is well for man to use the findings of the scientist, to conserve and develop his resources, to enjoy his marriage, to raise fine children, to escape debilitating illness, to achieve a euphoria that extends over his span of years. How does he do this? How does one come upon such good fortune?

For one thing, it is *primarily* a matter of knowing. He has to know about immunization, or D.N.A., or chemotherapy, or nutritional imbalances. He is not born thoroughly equipped with knowledge about nutrition or human reproduction or the effects of radiation or means of attaining emotional orientation. He is not born knowing about the components of personal development, about quackery, or about criteria for judging health services. He has to learn these things. He has to know that he can order a life, given a fair break from circumstance, that will be rewarding and will bring out his potential.

And this means he has to read and study and listen. He cannot recapitulate every scientific advance himself. He has to learn from the experience of others through books and talk and through whatever recapitulated experience his teachers can arrange for him. This means education—*organized, planned education*.

It is at this point where education as now organized in school and college has *not* accepted its responsibility to the degree the cultural influence of health education demands. The sort of knowledge and experience from the broad area of healthful living has not received the time, the dignity, or the quality of teaching personnel it requires. Our educational programs have been heavily weighted with the study about man's environment rather than about man himself. The student from elementary grades through college is pretty generally shortchanged. He is inadequately dealt with at this juncture in his educational development where he would have every right to expect assistance in the interpretation of what the life sciences have to offer. He meets too frequently unintelligent inertia and neglect from the academic hierarchy. His health education remains impoverished, because health education has not yet been accorded the status of academic respectability and is not yet thought of generally as an "academic discipline" worthy of full standing in the curriculum family. There are far too many states and local districts where school officials are seemingly oblivious to the importance of this kind of education.

Evolutionary change in curriculum matters is a slow process. It takes time. Even physical science struggled for years to gain acceptance. So did engineering and pharmacy and medicine itself. Home economics, agriculture, health education, and physical education have not yet fully found it. Reform comes slowly in education. Where it does come, there is always the danger that when an economy wave strikes or someone feels the need to "return to the three Rs," the public or the legislature will cry out for a return to those good old fundamental subjects, they will do away with the frills and new-fangled ideas!

Education aimed to make people healthier has been caught up in this resistance to change. Here is this great mass of information about man—about man in relation to himself and his environment—and organized education in America simply has not embraced it and given it the status it should have. Perhaps only one on the inside can fully appreciate the local forces that cause this sorry state of affairs.

I know that some progress has been made in the development of school and college health education. I know that Horace Mann, a hundred or more years ago, recommended attention to health. I know courses in health were offered and textbooks were written even back in the 19th century. I know how Thomas D. Wood and other 20th century pioneers struggled to insinuate some education in health in the curriculums and programs of schools. All is not hopeless and barren, of course.

I know of the heroic efforts since 1911 of the Joint Committee on Health Problems of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association, but I also know that in the influential book *General Education in a Free Society* (Harvard College) written in 1945, and a prototype for all "general education" studies since, not a single mention is made of health education or the need of Harvard men to know anything about the organization and administration of their own lives. I know, of course, of the impact made by the conferences on physicians and schools sponsored by the American Medical Association. They have been, in my judgment, the most significant single influence in recent years in the constructive development of school programs in health education. But I also know of the thousands of schools scattered over the land where the results of such deliberations have not penetrated, where administrators in teacher education refuse the advice of the scientist, and where the child who goes to school is actually in jeopardy from sickness or accident.

There have been many fine conferences and professional meetings on curriculum, teacher preparation, and research conducted by health education organizations, but in the recent national conference of a powerful group known as TEPS (Teacher Education and Professional Standards) *not one section* was devoted to teacher education in health education. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, sometimes thought of as the elite of all educational organizations, published a fine book called *New Insights and the Curriculum* in 1963,[1] and although many other areas are mentioned and many illustrations used from these areas, conspicuously few are drawn from the area of health education. For example, in a chapter on "Self-Management Capacities in Children," there is *no* discussion of the relation of health to self-management! What an astonishing oversight!

This summer I studied Jerome Bruner's two small and popular books published in 1963, *The Process of Education,*[2] dealing with curriculum and learning, and *On Knowing.*[3] The first reported the author's summary of a conference held at Wood's Hole in September 1959, at which scientists, historians, mathematicians, educators, psychologists, and others talked for 10 days about how better to develop curriculums for elementary and secondary schools and how better to teach. The makeup of the group left something to be desired. There was not one elementary school teacher included. Surely a half dozen smart, experienced elementary teachers would not have detracted from the conference! There was only one physician in the group (and he from the Rockefeller Foundation). I have learned intuitively (to use one of the conference's expressions) that four or five physicians, including a couple of good practicing pediatricians, add wisdom to any group. But wisdom from such people was not called upon. And to the extent it was not—just to that extent can the results of the conference be useful!

But my point is that as I tried to comprehend what Professor Bruner was driving at, I kept looking, as I always do, for the examples he uses to illustrate his points. In *The Process of Education* not one was used from the field of health education. The science of biology was given the grace of one illuminating illustration and that of an inchworm climbing an inclined plane from which students are to realize that they have discovered a "tropism,. . . indeed a geotropism" from which the teacher can go on to show that among simple organisms such phenomena as the regulation of locomotion by a fixed or built-in standard are the rule! Fascinating, no doubt, but is this the best way to capitalize upon the treasures of biology in order to answer some of man's crying needs to understand himself?

The application of biology to human health problems apparently does not occur to those people. Such general concepts as the immune process, psychophysiological relationships, the mathematics of heredity, the relation of chemistry to metabolism and psychic states—none of the fundamental concepts of health appear to these people as worth educating about. At least one sensitive to the great need for health instruction might come to that conclusion.

I know also of the required courses in health education at the college level. There are seven or eight hundred of these scattered throughout our large universities and small colleges. Most of them are one- or two-credit courses where the staff, with great heroism, tries to deal with 400 or 4,000 freshmen on a lecture or lecture-discussion basis to bring these people the world. Meanwhile the "general education" requirements of the first two years of most of those curriculums will be 15 hours of science or social studies or the humanities. In some places an integrated science course, where the material is chosen largely for its relevance to man's world and not man himself, is assigned 10 credit hours. A splendid education is provided, no doubt, but from the standpoint of our interests in education in health, the material taught in the sciences is, for the most part, as barren as the famous wastelands of television. The applications of biological science to the personal problems of living are virtually nonexistent in the curriculums of these colleges.

Yet to claim a broad and liberal education without including quite a bit about one's own physical, emotional, and mental mechanisms and their care is nonsense. It is as if these faculties were actually afraid to study man himself for fear such a study might not be academically respectable! So many of our vocal academicians give firm and unswerving allegiance to the theory that the undergraduate—or graduate student for that matter—should be taught to deal with the impersonal objective theory or principle, and once armed with the scientific principle, he will be able to proceed to the solution of his intimate personal problems by drawing on this theoretical background.

Such dreamers these people are! So out of contact with the world of living problems! Recently a writer[4] on high school science, Richard Rasmussen, gave us the directions science should take:

> The conceptualization of science knowledge refers to the student's development of patterns or generalizations which enable him to fit into a meaningful configuration otherwise unmanageable or discrete facts. This approach enables the student to identify common elements of a phenomenon or group of phenomena and to use this knowledge to 'discriminate, or classify, or analyze,' or on the other hand, to 'combine, or associate, or synthesize.' Conceptualization places emphasis on understanding and thus enables the student to control and interpret larger bodies of facts than he could through concentration on factual mastery.
>
> The depiction of science as a mode of inquiry requires that the spirit of discovery permeate the science classroom and laboratory. Science can then become, for the student, an adventure in exploring the unknown. He should come to know better the structure of science, its methods of investigation, its potential, and its limitations. He should gain understanding of the tentative nature of the knowledge with which it deals, and somewhere catch a glimpse of the frontiers of scientific knowledge.

I'm not that kind of a scientist, and I do not happen to believe *that* conception of science as a teachable element is worth much. It is far too distant from the problems that are meaningful to man and ignores completely both common everyday experiences of children and any realization that learning is a very personalized thing. It fails to realize that objectivity or cold and impersonal concepts may be deterrents to rather than stimulants of learning.

But why should the academician take these positions and be reluctant to give curriculum ground and credence to a study of viable man and his problems? As I see it, there are two reasons—one, a tradition stands in the way, and two, the internal institutional competition is too keen.

We inherited most of our format for education three centuries ago from the ancient European universities: the lecture system, large classes, the cap and gown, the system of degrees, ranks, tenure, and academic prerogative, the format of curriculum, and most significant of all, our sense of what is "academic" and what is not. Only literature, mathematics, and philosophy were originally accredited, but in the last century the bars have been let down a bit to admit physics, chemistry, physiology and a few others to the hierarchy of "academic" standing. Today, the gradations of respectability are clear, inflexible, obstructive, and indefensible. All you have to be is a professor of agriculture or business or health education or home economics or physical education to feel the insidious opposition to any proposals that might improve the quality of education in or about personal health.

Even the fine reports written by Dr. Conant and his group reluctantly and without enthusiastic elaboration mention that health education might have a small spot in the curriculum in secondary education. But not too much of a spot! In Conant's latest report, *The Education of American Teachers,* a recommendation for preparation of classroom teachers in health education is lacking entirely, even though study after study has shown the paucity of preparation currently given teachers in the area of child health.

One has only to read some of the outspoken critics of American education such as Professor Bestor, Chancellor Hutchins, Clifton Fadiman, Martin Meyer, or the *New Yorker* or *Time* or *The Atomic Admiral* or even John Steinbeck, to squirm in discomfort at either the unfairness of their comment or the ignorance from which it is made. Traditions born in antiquity are strong indeed.

The competitive situation within education, particularly higher education, is clear enough. Who wants to give up advantage gained? For centuries, and particularly in the last century, we have been assured that the academic subjects contained within the liberal arts and sciences represented the epitome of education, if not the only worthwhile kind. As soon as, early in this century, other disciplines arose (commerce, agriculture, engineering) to challenge arts and sciences for a spot in the sun, the advocates of the arts struck back with violence and have fairly well succeeded in shaming everyone concerned into preserving the integrity of the traditional arts and science curriculum as the only respectable academic road to an education. One hears at every sound of the campus chimes that some things are "academic" and thus untouchable and some things are not—although in 40 years of university teaching, I have not had an intelligent distinction drawn for me.

At the level of secondary education there has been an ebb and flow of the academic tide—mostly flow—as commission after commission has sought to solve the riddle of how to deal with the millions of American children in our high schools. What shall be the common denominators, if any, for all in secondary education? The system of evaluating high school graduation requirements by the Carnegie units and the use of the College Board Examination have had a profound effect on the stabilization of the curriculums and have made it most difficult for any newcomer such as health education to gain any sort of prestige. Hence, health education as a visible solid subject in secondary education is struggling for its existence and has but a beachhead in the curriculum.

I hope this criticism of academic practice will not be construed as another instance of anti-intellectualism on the part of a specialist in education.[4] It should *not* be so construed because, *as the entire theme of this presentation points out, the introduction or development of studies to enhance personal health contributes to intellectual power and does not detract from it.*

Our point is that the capacity of the individual to learn will be conditioned by the quality of the cells doing the learning. Whatever learning takes place depends upon the receptivity of the cells involved, which is to say that good psychobiological states are conducive to good learning and that life is best managed if one has been taught how to manage life best.

There is no hostility at all in the effort behind health education, but a genuine effort to contribute something worthwhile to the education of all young people. Actually, it is the opponent of health education and physical education programs in education who is the anti-intellectual in that he refuses to face or accept the truth about man and the conditions under which he learns best.

There are bright spots, of course. Such writers on curriculum as Van Til and the Albertys can be counted on to see the areas of personal development, physical and mental health, and leisure as important areas for education. Los Angeles recently made health instruction a requirement at the secondary level. Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, and dozens of other large and small cities have had good programs. These people in these places have been endeavoring to bring some knowledge to children vis-a-vis the health problems of mankind.

Studies have shown that a good share of health instruction, particularly at the secondary level, is given by physical education teachers. For this effort they are given very little thanks and an ample amount of abuse. They are said to be ill prepared, careless in their attention to the task before them, and uninterested in their assignment. It may be that some of this is true, but did it ever occur to the critics of the physical education teachers thus involved that they did not ask for this assignment? It has been imposed upon them because they were closest to it. Did it ever occur to the critics that there *is* no appreciable personnel in health education at the secondary level? If the job is to be done at all, who is going to do it? I doubt if the rank and file of people in physical education feel any vested interest in health education, and if TEPS or the NEA or the ACTE or NCATE would create personnel in the field, I dare say personnel in physical education would, for the most part, relinquish the responsibilities and resume teaching in the important field of motor activity.

There are only three available courses of action: (a) the preparation of physical education teachers in health education can be improved on a nationwide basis until their competence in health education is acceptable; (b) a new body of teachers to be called health educators can be developed (and this is slowly, ever so slowly, getting off the ground); or (c) we can forget the whole thing and ask biological or general science teachers to revolutionize their material and methods and deal with personal and public health problems properly. In the meantime, I suggest we *not* retard the development of health education just because we may not like the cut of the jib of the teacher available to accept the responsibility. I said this 20 years ago and 10 years ago, and I repeat it now. There is no justice in denying health education a place in educational thinking merely because it is taught poorly in some places and by some people.

Then there is the matter of the relation between school health education and public health education. Somewhere along the line we have created something called public health education and public health educators. (Did you ever hear of public mathematics educators?) These people and this endeavor bid fair to be a significant addition to the educational continuum in matters of health. Surely as long as organized education in school and college fails to do the job, public health education should and must step into the breech. There is a job to be done, and the public health educator is doing it well.

But in what relation to school health education—to the school and college curriculum? Are public health education and school health education two independent, unrelated phenomena on the education scene? One is tempted to think so by observing certain contemporary signs. For example, the other day I was reading an article in the April 1963 *American Journal of Public Health* entitled "The Public Health Educator's Bookshelf." I looked through it carefully, checking off the books I should read but haven't. When I had gone through the list, I realized that the public health educators had been encouraged to read not one book or article in school health education! Are they supposed to know *nothing* of school programs and curriculums? A list of recommended periodicals was given. I presume it is true that hell hath no fury like a woman spurned, but I suggest a good runner-up is an editor whose publication is not listed—when it should be! Are we to gather that *public* health education in neither program nor personnel has anything in common with school health education and need not be concerned with what goes on in organized education?

How, in all good sense, can this be? There are clusters of public health educators in state departments of health assigned as school health consultants. Need they not be teachers or at least know something about schools and the processes of education? And how can departments of public instruction explain their obvious neglect of school health education to the point where departments of health are now providing the needed consulting and program building services? Would this be another instance of abrogation of responsibility and prerogative on the part of educators? Surely it is not asking too much of organizations and personnel in the school and public health fields that they go about their business in some kind of informed relationship even to the point of being intelligent and cooperative about their virtually identical fields of interest.

So far I have mentioned only two areas of intramural conflict retarding growth in education in relation to health. There are others. There is an important discrepancy in availability of funds for projects and for research at both national and state levels between school health education and public health education. There is the unpretty spectacle of the Executive Branch of the federal government setting up a program advertised as having something to do with youth fitness but whose publications, personnel, and program seem to have very little to do with the evidence and needs in the area. And there are a few other impediments scattered around, all of which get in the way of all-out constructive effort to place health education squarely on its feet as a fully integrated element in American education.

That day will come. It *has* to come. To quote Norman Cousins in the March 19, 1960, *Saturday Review,* "There can be no more important education today than education for personal effectiveness. . . ." Education in health is at the center of such a quality.[5]

Now let's look at the other side of the coin. We said in the beginning that one needs abundant health to get the most out of one's education. Is this true? It is unless all we know about the unified holistic nature of man is false. The point hardly needs arguing before a scientific group but it does before educators who know a lot less about the human organism than a biological scientist.

The uninformed are likely to take the position that intellectual activity is one thing and organic or "physical" factors are quite another and that the former goes on without any particular dependence upon any other aspect of the organism. They are unimpressed with the implications of psychosomatic relationships. In fact, they may deny their existence. They see no relation of physiological states to the intellect and maintain that the intellect alone can be "trained." They think of the "mind" or "intellect" as the medieval poets and philosophers did—as an independent entity waiting to be cultivated by a rigorous schooling.

Thus, educational programs of today patterned after the 17th century European university need be concerned not with the learner as an organic unity but only with the material to be learned, only with knowledge. Education is, in this view, only an intellectual exercise, and the intellect is something apart from the rest of the organism.

This is a familiar view. Mind is all-important. The cultivation of the intellect is the only important goal. If "body" is thought of at all, it is as the hotel for the mind—merely as something for the mind to be housed in. The impossibly unscientific old cliché of the sound body housing the sound mind expresses this relationship.

This point of view obstructs effort to involve either instruction or services relating to the health and welfare of students into an educational program. Medical guidance, health counseling, physical education programs, even safe and adequate housing and food services are developed begrudgingly as necessary nuisances but really having no relation to the basic purposes of education! The inertia and the malpractice connected with this point of view takes a heavy toll in student health and are responsible for much wastage of teaching effort because students may simply not be fit enough to receive the education intended for them! It is really difficult to teach someone if he is exhausted or if he has mononucleosis. And it is worse if no one cares.

Lawrence Frank, for example, wonders what difference it would make in our thinking if we began to take seriously the possibility that potentiality is often interfered with or damaged by prenatal or fetal mishaps. Or, perhaps more immediately relevant as we now see it, what would happen if we understood fully and could help parents understand how the way children are cared for affects the ability they develop for making use of themselves? What might we be able to do if we worked out a more responsible position for the school as an agency for the retrieval and development of human capacities?

I remember talking with two engineering professors recently who, with considerable pride, described the complete exhaustion of most of their students at commencement time because of the rigorous pressures of their senior year from which all leisure or other nonsense had been removed. In fact, said they, it took some of the men six months to recover and two of them had to go to the hospital! Such is the way some educators have responded to the no-nonsense wave in education as led by our doughty submarine admiral and others equally uninformed about the nature of the learning process or of the man who does the learning.

What these people do not understand is that when one learns, one learns with all the organism and not merely the cerebral part of it. Intellectual, physical, and emotional development are all the same thing. They are merely emphases of function, but they all originate in and are dependent upon the nature and nurture of the cell. The cell, wherever it is found—brain, muscle, gland—is the center, the unit, of life. What influences cells influences life—and learning. Furthermore, and perhaps most important, all cells wherever they are bear a relationship to all other cells, are influenced by the same metabolic factors, and react to each other in the very complex interrelationships of which man is made. Learning, thought of by many as a purely intellectual process unrelated to fatigue, or anemia, or nutrition is *very much* related to these.

So is motivation, which can as easily be affected by a stimulating teacher, a moving play, adequate nutrition, or a better functioning thyroid. Learning is the product of *all* the organism, *all* the physiology, *all* the structure, as well as all the stimuli imposed in the classroom and community.

On this side of the coin there is a clear admonition to education to mind well the health and welfare of students. We in education can provide the best teachers in the world and the finest facilities and materials, but if an inherited inferior protoplasm is against us or if anxiety or disease or low energy or similar factors from the world of nurture are against us, we can fully count on less than brilliant response from our students.

No matter how you add it up, the health of the learner comes first. No matter how the ''intellectual'' squirms and protests against the consideration of such ''nonacademic'' matters, he had better pay attention to the total organism and not try to divide him for his own convenience. It does not work.

What does all this mean in terms of program? I have tried to point out that health—and education—have a great mutuality of interest. Neither can get along very well without the other. But in modern programming only the beginning of a mutually profitable relationship has been made. We are on our way but have a long way to go. I have some suggestions for such continued development:

1. We must continue our unremitting efforts at local and state levels to

develop *and extend* courses of study and curriculums in health education throughout the educational system from elementary school to college. No retreat in face of any pressures or neglect is indicated. Education in health just happens to be the most important fundamental in *all* of education.

2. Someone by some means should finance and support the development of a national curriculum study in health education. There are such studies now going on in language, chemistry, physics, and mathematics. In fact, there are two or three such studies going on in some of these areas. The federal government has appropriated more than $200 million to support summer institutes for science teachers and the National Science Foundation approximately $30 million to develop modern high school courses. They are highly useful. The studies are strengthening these areas all over the country. There should be such an effort in health education, well financed and staffed and national in scope.

3. Through some agency, federal or otherwise, we should develop a whole battery of institutes, workshops, scholarships, and other devices to improve teaching and teachers in health education. What the National Science Foundation has done for science teachers should be done for health education teachers. More inservice opportunities for classroom teachers for improvement of teaching in health education are urgently needed.

4. There should be a massive national effort to open up school health education as a recognized "solid" teaching field with a recognized and accredited personnel. No small effort or one-year program will be effective here. We need 100,000 teachers in this field easily. It is high time health education moved out of the "special subject" area into the "solid" class along with other "tool" subjects. If health is not a "tool" to be used in the process of living, I fail to know what it is.

5. As a companion recommendation to the foregoing, state departments of public instruction should review their attitudes toward health education. Health education could well be considered a discipline or a field like mathematics or language arts, and requirements for all teachers should be established appropriate to their grade level and function.

6. We need greater, more intelligent, more productive cooperation between the principal professional organizations now in the field: the American School Health Association, the School Health and Public Health sections of the American Public Health Association, the Health Education Division of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, the Society of Public Health Educators, and the representative nursing organizations. Just why we have these separate and independent groups all generically

related is beyond me, but we do and I'm not suggesting any organic coalition at this time. I know better! But at least they should get together once in a while at either committee, commission, or session level and discuss common and related problems.

7. We should, as individuals and as groups, continue to develop the proper image of health education in all and sundry education boards, associations, and commissions. The Educational Policies Commission, for example, or ASCD should not only be aware of health education, but personnel from health education should be in attendance at the meetings, serving on committees and as officers. To my knowledge only three people from health education and physical education attended the recent TEPS meeting. Wouldn't it be fine if more joint meetings could be arranged? Perhaps this development of a proper image of health education could be a project for our Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education. That idea has possibilities.

8. Organized medicine, through state and local medical societies, should continue its fine cooperative relationships with educational groups.

9. Educational groups should increase their efforts to seek out and use medical consultation on all matters of health programming and curriculum development. If there is a liaison between health and education at the organic and holistic levels, such a liaison can be recognized operationally only if personnel in education and the health sciences join in the development. If we can continue our efforts to reconstruct basic concepts of the educational progress and its purposes, it will require cooperative action united against those who would fragment the child and deal with him only as an intellect ready to be trained to the will of the authoritarian.

10. And last, we must all lift health education out of the uninspired and old-fashioned pattern of presenting its material "merely as an aggregate of facts, often as truisms put together with a suffusion of majesty about their factualness." Facts alone do not always solve problems. We must seek, and help our students seek, the substratum of ideas beneath the facts—those ideas that unify and give meaning to all scientific knowledge. It is this substratum we must reach if we are to be permanently effective in affecting behavior and motivation. The ideas and facts from science will integrate with those from philosophy and religion and ethics and history and will thus have greater chance to become a part of the learning matrix of reason. We must remember Locke's characterization of understanding as "the thing that sets man above the rest of sensible beings and gives him all the advantage and dominion he has over them." Science, which has given us most of the facts for health education, having taught us "how to swim in the seas like fish, how to fly through the air like birds, to rise into space like demigods, may finally teach us to walk the earth like men."[4]

NOTES

1. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "New Insights and the Curriculum," in *1963 Yearbook* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1963), p. 4 ff.
2. Bruner, Jerome, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge: The Harvard Press, 1963).
3. Bruner, Jerome, *On Knowing* (Cambridge: The Harvard Press, 1963).
4. Rasmusson, H. Richard, "How Far Can Science Reach?" *Main Currents In Modern Thought* 19, no. 4, March-April 1963, p. 85.
5. Cousins, Norman, "Education Against Helplessness," *Saturday Review*, March 19, 1960, p. 22.

RELATED READINGS

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. "What Are the Sources of Curriculum?" (A Symposium). Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1962.

Commission on Philosophy for Health Education. "A Point of View for School Health Education." *The Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation* 33, no. 8, Nov. 1962, p. 24.

Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. "Men, Apes and Termites." *Saturday Review*, Sept. 21, 1963.

Margenau, Henry. "The New Style of Science." *Main Currents in Modern Thought* 19, no. 5, May-June 1963, p. 103.

Roberts, Beryl J.; Grossman, Jerome; and Griffiths, William. "The Public Health Educator's Bookshelf." *The American Journal of Public Health* 53, no. 4, April 1963, p. 531.

Rutledge, James A. "Changing Emphases in High School Science." *Theory Into Practice*, Dec. 1962, p. 264, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

"School Science: Trends and Issues." *Theory Into Practice*, Dec. 1962, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Sinnott, Edmund W. *The Biology of the Spirit*. New York: Viking Press, 1955.

Sliepcevich, Elena M. "Should Public Health Be Interested in School and College Health Programs?" *The Journal of School Health* 33, no. 4, April 1963.

Turner, Clair E. "Challenges Confronting Health Education and the International Union." *The International Journal of Health Education* 5, July-Sept. 1962-63, p. 105.

Health and Education — An Appraisal II

Four years ago, at one of these remarkable conferences, we gave a paper by this title. Perhaps the time has come to have a look at what wonders four years hath wrought, if any.

We are happy to report progress in the extension of health education both as a curricular element and as a program of action in our schools and colleges. Maybe not in some aspects of the program and in certain sections of the country, but in the main we can report that health education is on the move. There is nothing stagnant about this field. Our efforts are bearing fruit. In what ways?

1. *In an awareness of the job before us.* We are, for example, becoming more impressed with the potential relationship of health education to the mental health problem of the nation and the contribution of the school to both the production and the prevention of psychological aberrations and maladjustments. We are beginning to see the magnitude of the problem. We are beginning to understand that we need more than merely a school psychologist to test aptitudes. To help children face the problems of this complex and tense society is important. To aid in the prevention of frustration, anxiety, doubt, and fear through individual counseling, group therapy, or whatever means is a channel

---

Delivered at the Eleventh Biennial Conference on Physicians and Schools, sponsored by the American Medical Association, Chicago, October 5, 1967.

of activity of increasing obligation to schools.[1] After all, the school causes some of this disturbance—it ought to act to prevent it.

We are beginning to see what John Gardner sees when he insists that we redouble our efforts to create an educational system that will provide the maximum individual fulfillment for each American.[2] A child cannot reach such fulfillment if his vision is impaired and could be improved if only someone knew about it. Fulfillment cannot be reached if a child contracts tuberculosis from a tuberculous teacher; if dental caries, hunger, or mononucleosis go undetected; or if life in the ghetto is overwhelming with its burdens of an imposed inferiority, emotional emasculation, hunger, and disease. There is scope for health education here beyond the simple teachings of personal hygiene!

We are becoming aware of our responsibility for the natural environment of our schools, homes, cities, and the rest of the world in which we live. Gardner makes the point that we must find some limit to the headlong destruction and fouling of our natural environment. We must make clear to our students their responsibility as citizens for the purity of the air; the safety of water; the esthetic quality of our cities and towns; the safety of our cars, appliances, aircraft, and all the other engineered features with which we live.

In addition to the sheer effect of the physical environment, we are slowly becoming aware of the psychological impact of what it means to live in an overcrowded, automated, urbanized community. Help is needed to prevent the overwhelming feeling of alienation from the good things in life.

We are becoming more and more aware of the essentially personal nature of health education. Health education is not like mathematics or geography—it is far more intimate. Our students look at matters of sex, for example, not as distant theoretical considerations, but as things to know about *now* and of importance to them as individuals. They want to know about health insurance and smoking and drugs and childbirth and abortion as a *personal* matter. They want to know how much credence they can put in the ads one sees on television. They want to know and talk about things as they are, not as they may show in some finely drawn but wholly impersonal science lecture.

We are becoming aware of our responsibilities as physicians, nurses, public health educators, and teachers in the decay and renewal of our cities, in urban renewal plans especially as they involve the renewal of schools.[3] We know there are health problems involved in Head Start, the Peace Corps, VISTA, and any other effort to alleviate the ignorance and poverty of this world. Our school physicians and nurses know of their involvement in the strife-torn cities from Watts to Detroit. They are aware of services needed not only to protect children from disease and danger but to remake human personality into something that can be lived with and to rebuild the communities into some sort of civilized state.

And we are increasingly aware of the affinity in purpose and program between public health and school health. Perhaps the full meaning of that brilliant article by Elena Sliepcevich, which appeared in 1963 is beginning to be understood by many more than got it the first time around.[4] Research in and support for school health education is primary to the whole structure of public health, and the sooner educational authorities, law-making bodies, and grant-giving agencies recognize this, the better off our world will be.

None of our old problems has disappeared. Disease prevention and detection, nutrition of school children, the emotional problems of the harassed college student, the need for vigorous play, the exposure of quackery—these and others are still with us. It should be clear to us all by now that in any human endeavor requiring energy of any sort and in any amount the success of that participation will depend in part, if not wholly, upon the quality of the organism participating. And to maintain and improve that quality is the main business of health education.

2. *In school administration*. There has been a heartening response among some school administrators to our drumbeating of the last few years. Important state school administrators, particularly in New York and Arizona, have written in national magazines encouraging the development of school health education in all its ramifications. The American Association of School Administrators devoted some ten sections at its annual meeting to health education, and Forrest Conner, the executive secretary, has written and spoken effectively for development, particularly in curriculum.

We have said for years that the principal, the superintendent, the state departments of education are crucial to the growth of health education. And they are. The Mayshark study, completed just a few months ago, places the burden squarely on the local leadership in the superintendent's office.[5] The study showed rather clearly in the five large city and county systems selected that the quality of school health programs is related to the administrative superstructure. Mayshark reports that the perception of the extent of health problems, the administrative action needed to solve these problems, and the amount of money spent for health education and health services all are directly related to the strength of the position taken by the top administrators. The details of the study indicate that where things are going badly or not at all, there is little or no concern given to health education at the top levels. Mayshark's first recommendation is that a course in the administration of school health programs be included among the requirements for the school superintendency. I used to teach a course of that sort years ago, until it was knocked out by one of the studies under a Kellogg grant. Perhaps the course is a bit too specific and useful for some graduate schools of education, but the people who have the job of developing programs of health education at the local level profit from it. Sure, the superintendent is a busy man—but he also can become a well-informed man. Thank heavens many of them are, or we would get nowhere with our programs of school health education.

No, there is healthy growth in attitude among school administration personnel. Resistance is lessening, but we still have a long way to go to attain full and enthusiastic support from school administration generally.

3. *In curriculum content, time, and method.* We are moving here, in some respects and in some places with giant strides. Although the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Fund for the Advancement of Education report the School Health Education Study as the only national project, there are dozens—perhaps hundreds—of local efforts being made to develop suggested curriculum materials. This well-marked trend began years ago with the development of state and local courses of study and continues today with the inclusion and use of modern materials and techniques. Generally speaking, I believe that health instruction is at long last coming to be academically respectable, with a body of content attractive and useful to students.

If it is not, we might as well give up right now. The competition for space and time in the curriculum is so keen that we had better put our best foot forward now. We had better examine carefully all of the material in all of the grades and eliminate all trivial materials and all duplications.

The time is now for us to work out an amalgam of all the material related to health—central and peripheral; general, segmented, or specific—and present to the educational world a truly integrated curriculum. We would include all significant material from what is now being taught as health education, safety education, first aid, medical self-help, driver training, and any special courses or lectures on sex or family life education or venereal disease. By so doing, we can open up health instruction to a progressive curriculum development from the primary years right through college.

For some unaccountable reason, we have inadvertently sold health instruction short at the higher levels. Only within the last few years have textbook writers and high school and college teachers included problems worthy of adolescent age groups. There must be more. For example, everyone seems to say our present racial strife is an "unhealthy" situation. What do they mean by "unhealthy"? Perhaps there are elements of riotous behavior that have an origin in the state of health of the individual rioter. What *is* the physiology of

Detroit? Is there some psychopathology involved in what happened in Newark or Dayton? Was there hunger, disease, frustration? Can we deal with frustration and bias and anxiety at the high school level in health instruction or are such matters too esoteric to teach?

Do our health textbooks deal with racial differences and similarities sufficiently? I am afraid not. Studies made some time ago showed that very few, if any, textbooks laid to rest certain false ideas about racial differences such as alleged differences in sexuality.[6] No wonder "whitey" has some false notions of superiority. I wonder how many college teachers, or senior high school teachers for that matter, in a discussion of inter-racial marriage ever used Ashley Montagu's gem, *Statement on Race*, or *What Is Race–Evidence from Scientists*, the United Nations statement on racial similarity?[7,8] If health instruction purports to deal with the health of human beings, then let us go beyond the ordinary into the important.

And genetics. Why have we not embraced as thorough a study of genetics, human heredity, D.N.A., and all of the material our people would be grateful to know about? Or the relation of genetics to inherited characteristics, problems in adoption, transmissibility of alcoholism, mate selection, and other matters? Because we have defaulted to biological science. We should reclaim from biology, general science, botany, home economics, physical education, chemistry, and any other area every scrap of material that bears upon the health of human beings and make that material an integral and central part of modern health instruction. Those areas should be supplementary to health instruction—not health instruction supplementary to them. Need a discussion of chemotherapy for insanity be limited to or originate in chemistry? Indeed not. It is part of the fabric of health instruction because the central problem is one of human behavior. Let the biologists continue to play with platypuses and nematodes; we should deal with any and every problem involving the quality of human life and its living.

What about medical care? Is a discussion of the rising costs of medical care inappropriate for health instruction? Or the social philosophy of Medicare? Or hospital insurance? Or doctor's fees? Or the patient's relation to the ethics or economics of medical practice? Are these off limits to the high school or college health class? I think not. I believe they are crucial to any intelligent approach to one's own health problems and should be a part of the learning experience in health education.

And sex education. I believe now is the time to open up full throttle in this area of relative darkness, false morality, and fear. I shall return to this subject.

Problems of environmental health and pollution? Certainly. Of housing in relation to health, of poverty and the school dropout in relation to physical and psychological states? That is our business. Should we teach about hunger and revolution, about the reasons for the existence of venereal diseases, about new speculations about rhythm, noise, and light? Why not?

How do we prepare people for change? How can we teach people to be aware, alert, receptive to new ideas so they will embrace new scientific discoveries and not forget them or go to pieces in face of them?

Can we produce a population committed to the idea of eradicating starvation, pestilence, organic malfunction, and mental and emotional disorder not merely nationally but on a worldwide basis?

These are some of the big problems that fall within the purview of school health education. We had better get busy and teach things that are significant for 1970 and 1980.

But how? God forbid that we ever develop the lecture series again. Let us keep our classes student-oriented in terms of their problems, their needs, their approach. I hope we never again presume to know what students ought to know unless we can prove that what we teach is what they really need in order to cope with their world. And I hope we realize that health education includes living problems and not anatomy and physiology and embryology and immunology *per se*. Those sciences are important accumulations of knowledge relating to some segmented area of life. Health instruction calls upon the facts to explain the problems, but it starts with the problem. It begins with "how do I know when I'm in love?" and may wind up with ovulation and the vas deferens and spirochetes as helpful considerations in the discussion of the question. To organize and to conduct a class on this basis the lecture will be used sparingly and discussion, research, and problem-solving techniques rather fully. If people think they can make much of a ripple on the waters—much of an impact on students—by developing a series of "health lectures" aimed at "telling these kids what it's all about," they had better sit down and rest awhile!

Surely to deal with the expanding importance of health instruction we are going to need time. None of this once-a week or rainy-day period will do in the future. Someone has to move over. Who? Well, can you give me any plausible reason why *all* high school students should be taking algebra? Or calculus? Is there any real supportable reason why *all* students need two years of Latin, or *any* language for that matter? Or four years of chemistry? What is this mystique we have thrown up around the so-called "liberal arts"? What is a liberal art? What's liberal about it?

We built our concept of a "good" education in terms of what our early "aristocracy" wanted—a liberal arts education. This concept has persisted; it is weakening somewhat, but it persists. Just look at College Board examination questions if you think that aristocratic concept has disappeared. Or face the scorn of the arts college people if you seek academic recognition for vocational agriculture or industrial arts or aviational science. These areas, they say, do not produce educated people—merely mechanics!

Have you ever studied the dropout problem? Do you know anything about the Job Corps? I have heard allegedly intelligent people condemn the dropout and the Job Corps worker as lazy louts who just do not appreciate what American education has to offer them. No, they don't. Not when American education has required them to memorize the names and dates of the French kings and tells them such talent is the mark of educated persons. American education has missed its mark.

James B. Conant shocked us a few years ago by proposing some changes in secondary education. He didn't go far enough. The whole curriculum of American education from about the fourth grade through college should be picked up and shaken by its academic neck. Maybe a few hitherto sacrosanct nonessentials will fall out! We need to take a good long look at the alleged values in making compulsory certain "solid subjects" like four years of math and other traditional subjects. Maybe we should not be afraid of or coerced by the liberal arts advocate who continues to block progress in curriculum reform. It has been my observation that a total immersion in the liberal arts has produced some of the most tightly closed academic minds of our time. They have come to believe without peradventure of doubt in their own spurious omniscience.

The result of this persistent misconception of what education is or might be has been to lose over 50 percent of our school population in terms of reaching their potential. We don't have a literate population; we have mainly an illiterate one, except possibly in terms of reading and writing. If you define literacy in terms of intelligent human behavior—in terms of life management, the use of science in solving human problems, child care, psychological adaptations to the pressures of the world, accident prevention, drug usage, and in dozens of other categories—we *are* an illiterate people. How can you say otherwise when we have flubbed for a hundred years in solving such problems as poverty, disease, war, mental health, and racial discrimination? How can we be proud of the level of our education when our lawmakers will spend millions on the boll weevil and cruelly kill a bill that would have killed rats that kill children? A fourth year of algebra or calculus? No thanks! I prefer some study a little closer to human life and its problems. As long as we studiously delude ourselves into thinking that it is more important to know the atomic table or the structure of the heart in reptiles than to know about ourselves and our problems and about the world we create for ourselves, then I believe our values are all mixed up!

I have heard it said that health education needs to affiliate with older, more respectable subjects like science, for example, to get the prestige and acceptance we need. So we have courses in health science. If we are talking about courses in the science of living, then I have no objection. But if health education is merely being correlated with an already-established curriculum in general or biological science, then we should have none of it. Since when has a study of glacial flow been senior in importance to a study of malignant diseases or the sexual impulse?

We need to realize that life management, how to master one's environment, how to stay alive in a hostile world, how to raise a family, how to love thy neighbor, how to achieve the fruits of one's labors, how to know beauty are the important things in life. If the French kings or logarithms are significant to these objectives then very well and good. They may be—but youth has to be shown.

If our values are straight and we value human life above all else, then health education becomes one of the master areas in all of American education, along with language. It deals, or should deal, with the nature of life and problems of life management, with all those phenomena indigenous to being human, that develop or retard, create or kill. Nothing is more important. Time must be found for it.

4. *In sex education.* One of the most promising, at the same time most amusing, developments in recent years has been the explosion of interest in sex education. Shades of Maurice Bigelow and the old American Social Hygiene Association! Dr. Bigelow, I am sure, must be smiling beatifically as he looks down upon the rapidly spreading realization on the part of community groups, professional organizations, eager young teachers, physicians, and others who have come upon this need and vow to do something about it. If we don't watch out, sex may become a respectable area of study in the curriculum before another few years have passed!

Study after study has been made of the need. There is nothing new about the problem. I remember making a four-year study of the sexual questions of college students just 40 years ago and reporting the study to intelligent women of the AAUW, who gasped with astonishment that their sons and daughters ever entertained such curiosities. The same responses may be had today when people read in the recent paperback *Suggested Program issued by the American School Health Association,* of "typical questions asked by students."[9] Reactions of parents are either that they don't believe their children ask those questions or that they haven't the faintest idea how to answer some of them and they wish the questions—and the children—would go away. But they won't. And you and I had better do some strenuous thinking on this problem in order to meet not only present needs but the needs of a society that gives every evidence of shifting its moral and scientific base.

Let me try to be realistic. If we have any communal intent to preserve the monagamous family, chastity before marriage (at least for the very young), permanence of marriage, decent and friendly relations between boys and girls, and the beautiful notion that marriages are made in heaven, then we had better take off the gloves, not be quite so sensitive to the community critic, and go to work.

How? I for one believe that education about this heterosexual life we lead has a broad potential, involves every teacher in the school, and should begin early and stay late. There is no excuse for preparing English teachers, music teachers, social science teachers especially, or any other teachers ignorant of the problem. This area belongs to no one teacher because the area permeates all of life. Have you been listening to any of the popular lyrics lately? Seen any good movies? I'll wager that insolent and fascinating character superbly played by Michael Caine in *Alfie* had more of an effect on hundreds of thousands of adolescents this year than the best visual you used in your classroom!

Furthermore, I just don't believe the old cliché that "the fundamental responsibility for instruction about sex resides in the home" or with the family minister—or even the doctor. I don't mean to be offensive at this point, but many of these people just don't know enough to do the job as it ought to be done; not, that is, without specific and further-than-the-usual preparation for the task. Leave this to parents and we leave it to well-meaning people (for the most part) who have had a high school education and no more, have never read a book on the subject, and whose experience is only between themselves. Parents are no more fundamentally responsible for the sexual instruction of their children than for the mathematical or the musical instruction. This kind of education is in the public domain and should be dealt with as such.

And equally tired am I of the barnyard approach to this subject. Just what the copulating habits of chickens or horses have to do with human love and reproduction escapes me. Just the other day I saw one of those slide series with the rooster fertilizing a rather reluctant hen and I thought, "How stupid can we get when we try to deal intelligently with the human being possessed of sensitivities, intelligence, and capacity for love by any such nonsense? The animal-birds-bees approach to sex education ought to be stuffed in the garbage can and remain there." Furthermore, if instruction in sex education is being introduced for the first time in some school systems it should come in as an integral part of a broad program of health instruction and not a segmented special sort of effort.

No, if we are to rise to meet this generation of students on their terms we need a much broader, deeper, and more inclusive teacher education program in the area. We need much broader programs of preparation for counselors of every kind. And surely we need a program of public clinics where services, informational and otherwise, may be obtained. But mainly to meet these young people on their terms we have to know what their terms are.

5. *In professional services.* How desperately we need the services of physicians, nurses, and public health personnel to help run a school the way it should be run! We are in short supply, particularly of physicians who know and care something about the learning process and its relation to the quality of the organism doing the learning. We keep talking about the development of human potential and how our great system of education provides an opportunity for the development of that potential if our young folk would only seize it. The opportunity is there and it *is* a great system of public education, but the system is not half so great as it might be, with the result that human potential is only partially tapped.

One reason is that we have not had access to and thus we have not learned to use the personal resources available. The inimitable Fritz Redl brings us up short when he speaks of community (and educational) leaders who are "tickled pink" when they get themselves one modern child-guidance clinic and manage to forget all about the "thousands of kids . . . still sitting around in jails with adults, in mental hospital wards of the 'snake pit' variety, in detention homes that are too poorly staffed or equipped to offer anything but 'detention'."[10]

I know a major Midwestern university whose dean and chairmen in education are seemingly content to allow their secondary school trainees remain oblivious to the health needs of their students, oblivious to the psychophysiological factors that make or break learning, oblivious to anything but the elements of the curriculum in which they teach. These teachers are being taught by default to believe that physicians have no counsel, no contribution to make to the learning adolescent, and teamwork among teachers, physicians, nurses, psychologists, and other thoughtful students of the human condition is wholly unnecessary. This is a good example of failure to prepare teachers to become intelligent participants on the "health team." But even worse, it is a good example of failure to prepare teachers to teach in accordance with the realities of the human condition.

There is much work to be done in school systems, also. Far too few are the schools where the intelligence of physicians, nurses, teachers, counselors, and others are all brought to bear upon the development of children. Coordination between physicians and teachers is well done in some places, but in most places and for most children no medical or nursing help is given at all as they seek this potential we keep talking about. I don't care particularly what you call these services—"pupil personnel services" seems to be a popular term—the important thing is to share intelligence about all those discoverable factors that help a child to learn and develop and to do something about those factors that impede his progress.

What is to be done about it? We have to increase the number of boards of education that will employ physicians as an integral part of the educational cadre developing the educational program. We have to increase the number of physicians and other ancillary personnel willing to make a career out of the educational process. One of my informants reports an educated guess that there has been some increase in recent years in medical personnel associated with schools, but he reports no figures are available.

Perhaps equally important, my informant reports, "I know of no university in the United States, and I doubt if there are any elsewhere, that produces a graduate medical education program directed toward school health service administration. This means that physicians hired by schools are usually clinical physicians, most likely from pediatrics, who know little or nothing about the schools or administrative programs. A few come from public health and know something about administration but not very much about the schools." Medical schools seem to be as slow or reluctant to develop needed personnel for school health education as colleges of education are slow and reluctant to prepare either general or special teachers for service in this field.

But the need persists. Learning is impeded by undiscovered disturbances, disorders, or defects. Children are failing because they cannot see. The rubella children of the classes of 1963-64-65 are largely ignored and undiscovered—deaf, hard of hearing, and many of them mentally retarded and with cardiac *and* visual defects. Who cares? The studies by Cauffman, Petersen, and Emrick show who do not get medical attention.[11] They are from the lower social and economic levels—blacks, Puerto Ricans, children whose parents are educated only to the high school level or below. Other factors operate, too, as Dr. Cauffman has pointed out. We have data enough to prove the need for medical assistance in the learning process. Don't expect too much of education until we really understand that it is the whole child who goes to school and not just his brain.

Look what can be done when a school system faces up to the realities of education. Read the annual reports of the Division of Medical Services of the Denver Public Schools. Read similar reports from Los Angeles or any one of a dozen smaller communities in New York or California, New Jersey or Ohio, New Mexico or Kansas, where enlightened medical, nursing, and educational personnel put their coordinated talents at the disposal of children who are trying to learn. We are making some headway, but it is too slow.

6. *Nursing services.* From evidence and observation picked up at random

from various states, I would say that here is the most rapidly growing, potentially useful, underpaid, and undereducated group in all of school health education. By undereducated I am referring to the thousands of school nurses who do not have teachers' certificates or bachelors or masters degrees and who need them in order to make the most out of the school nursing opportunity. In those states where nurses are prepared and certified as teachers—not just registered—and where their preparation goes far beyond the typical three-year nursing program, we find a source of valuable personnel for school health education. The opportunity for a well-prepared nurse to function constructively in school health education has not yet been fully described or fully realized.

But we will have to pay for that kind of professional service—commensurate with teachers and administrators—and we will have to shatter once and for all the image of the nurse as that applicator of first aid and investigator of school absences. There is a better world ahead for school nursing.

Too bad some of them think they have to go it alone in order to "get recognition." Personally I look with no favor at all on the activity of some of them in persuading the Board of Directors of the National Education Association to recommend departmental status for school nurses to become effective next year if approved by the general membership. This is fragmentation, when cohesion and team organization is needed. It is a step backward, and we will all be sorry the step was taken.

7. *In teacher preparation.* At last we seem to be getting somewhere in the preparation of teachers for health education. Tennessee, New York, Illinois, and a few other states report new laws or standards or developments of one kind or another that are stimulating to teacher preparation. Recent proposals for federal legislation (for example, H.R. 775 in the 90th Congress) seek to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by allowing for the development of institutes for the "training" of health education personnel. H.R. 777 would allow health educators to be eligible for traineeships. And if the Education Professions Development Act replaces the National Defense Education Act, it will provide for preparation in health education.

This is helpful. It will not solve the basic need for providing health education teachers in every school as we now have English or science teachers. We need thousands of health education teachers. We are getting hundreds. The bottleneck is in community demand. It begins there. Look what happened in New York State when the newspaper people read of the sorry state of affairs in health education nationally as reported four years ago by the *School Health Education Study.*[12] Communities became aroused to the need, the state department of education and the legislature went into action, and now there is a wholly new format for health education in New York schools. New York colleges are preparing more and more teachers to meet the need. Almost the same thing has happened in Tennessee, Los Angeles, and some other places.

But the development is painfully slow. There is still this terrible inertia within teacher preparation colleges, still the reluctance to see the problem. Only this spring did a major midwestern university discontinue a 30-year-old course that brought the message of health education to the secondary social studies and English teachers. Health education is still not a teaching field in too many states. And there are still too many poorly prepared physical education teachers struggling to do something with health education and not knowing how to do it.

Community demand may catch up with these lethargic teacher education departments in colleges. When it does I hope they have sense enough to move in the right direction.

8. *In professional unity*. There are dozens of professional and civic organizations that concern themselves in one way or another with the health of school children. From the Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services and the National Health Council to the ASHA and the APHA, from AAHPER and its Health Education Division to the Society of State Directors of Health and Physical Education. There are the great national associations in such areas as heart, tuberculosis, and cancer and the service clubs and fraternal orders such as the Lions and the Masonic Lodge. There are unlimited opportunities for service in this field.

Some of these organizations, committees, commissions, and associations are organized as a union of specialists concerned about only one aspect of the total health problem. What we need is more of an opportunity to share ideas and experiences—to seek answers not from our own kind, but from others. That interdisciplinary process has been the genius of the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education of the NEA and the AMA. (To my regret that committee has been discontinued.) The interdisciplinary experience has been the most significant contribution of the American School Health Association, where physicians, educators, dentists, nurses, and others have worked on committees together and exchanged debate in meetings and whose *Journal* contains the literary and research effort of all disciplines concerned with the health of the school child. We need to work together, not separately, and thus I repeat that I personally look with no favor at all on any effort to go it alone, to create other national organizations of a vertical sort. We need to strengthen the ties among nurses, teachers, dental hygienists, dentists, physicians, and others in pupil personnel services by an amalgam of some sort that will provide the strength united effort gives.

Conclusion. It would not be right to close without some thought borrowed from the current folk hero of American education. Four years ago it was Jerome Bruner, and we made sure we quoted from him. Today it is Marshall McLuhan.[13] They come and they go, and most of them leave a healthy mark on the educational structure and process. Even John Dewey did! Dr. McLuhan is very important to us all in this stage of life because he is giving us one of the most powerful arguments we've ever had for health education. If the people in physical education don't eat him up they are missing their best bet since Plato!

McLuhan makes the familiar point that when a child learns, he learns all over—or at least wants to learn all over. His total being wants to get in on the act, every one of his senses. He is holistically starved if we appeal only to the visual or the aural. And what have *we* been talking about for 50 years? We've been saying that child development, not knowledge alone, is the principal goal of education, and that development goes on best when the total child is involved. Hence, every facet of the modern program of school health education is central to education. If, as McLuhan says, kids are what the game is all about, then the whole complicated system of formal education is in business to get through to kids, to motivate kids, to help kids "learn stuff."[13] Schools are in business to communicate with children, and mononucleosis, or starvation, or the use of folk medicine, or a deficiency in the chemistry of learning, or ignorance of the human potential make communication difficult.

Let us hope we can see these directional signals and realize that we have much in common as we help children reach for their potential. Nothing could be more wasteful than to have us all—physicians, nurses, teachers, health educators, nutritionists, public health people—go our own way without finding strength in the coalescence of effort aimed at human development.

NOTES

1. Jack Langgoth, "California's Gift to Psychotherapy," *Harper's*, June 1967, p. 52.
2. John W. Gardner, "The Ten Commitments," *Saturday Review*, July 1, 1967, p. 39.
3. Peter Schrag, *Village School Downtown, A Boston Report* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967).
4. Elena M. Sliepcevich, "Should Public Health Be Interested in School and College Programs?" *Journal of School Health* 33, no. 4 R145, April 1963.
5. Cyrus Mayshark, "A Descriptive and Comparative Study of the Administrative Patterns Operative in Six School Health Programs," U.S. Office of Education, Project 6-8288 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, May 1967).
6. Robert S. Cobb, "An Evaluation of Current Methods and Materials in Health Education and Allied Areas with Particular Emphasis on the Origins of the Perpetuation of Elements of Racialism," The Ohio State University Library, 1951.
7. Ashley Montagu, *Statement on Race*, (New York: Henry Schuman, 1951).
8. *What Is Race—Evidence from Scientists* (Paris: Department of Mass Communication, UNESCO, 1952).

9. "Growth Patterns and Sex Education, A Suggested Program Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve," *The Journal of School Health* 37, no. 5a, May 1967.
10. Fritz Redl, *When We Deal With Children* (The Free Press, 1967).
11. Joy G. Cauffman, Elenora L. Petersen and John A. Emrick, "Medical Care of School Children," *American Journal of Public Health* 57, no. 1, Jan. 1967, p. 60.
12. Elena M. Sliepcevich, *School Health Education Study: A Summary Report* (Washington, DC: School Health Education Study, 1964).
13. John M. Culkin, "A Schoolmen's Guide to Marshall McLuhan," *Saturday Review*, March 18, 1967, p. 51.

The School as a Force for Health

In areas where civilization is most advanced there is a firm belief in the inherent worth and dignity of the human being. And wherever the worth of the human being is supreme there will be found a program of education devoted to the cultivation of that worth. *That* education is only for life; we never educate for death. Only in our schools of war do we train to kill. When we educate we do so to preserve life so that humans can survive, develop, and re-create.

Wherever mankind has endeavored to improve the vitality of people, to liberate them from the shackles of disease, hunger, and ignorance, and to aid them in the development of behavior that is creative rather than merely imitative, there has been a concentrated effort to apply science to the solution of human problems. Thus we witness the development of the classic trio of influences all directed towards the preservation and development of man's life; namely, discovery, application and education. The scientist *discovered* the cause of yellow fever, the swamps and lowlands were cleared, and children were *taught* how to prevent yellow fever. In Minnesota in 1952 there were 3,726 cases of poliomyelitis with 206 deaths. In 1964 there were three cases and no deaths. Why? Because the scientist *discovered* a vaccine, and parents and children were *educated* as to its virtues and safety.

Published in the *Journal of the Institute of Health Education*, July, 1966. Delivered at the Sixth International Conference on Health Education, Madrid, Spain, 1965.

It is a three-act play, no one act of which is complete without the other. The researchers find the cause and develop the antidote or treatment or technique of control; the treatment or environmental reform is implemented; and supplementing both is the process of informing, enlightening, *educating* the public about the matter from start to finish.

Perhaps of those three, education is the most important. Surely discovery and use are quite futile unless the individual develops behaviors that relate in an intelligent way to the revelation and application. In the last analysis, the human mind must understand and be willing to use the advance the scientist has made, or the cycle is incomplete and the results of the discovery are barren. This has been true a thousand times in man's march toward a civilized state.

Education is a force for health. It can be; it has to be. It is only a question of how much of a force it will be in any given country at any given time. Actually there are few nations more advanced than others in the discovery, control, and education about health problems. There are only nations that have different problems than others have—perhaps less disease here, more there; less insanity here, more there; more malnutrition here, less there. The world still numbers millions of persons with venereal disease because in only a few nations has education been encouraged in its control. Alcoholism is the tenth leading cause of death in one of our most populous states; chronic disease of the heart, vascular lesions, and cancer are serious the world over, and yet there are educational programs available to reduce their severity. Quackery, misleading advertising, superstition, and ignorance cost the world's populations billions of dollars in earning each year, millions of lives unnecessarily lost, and suffering and unnecessary death beyond description. In the United States alone last year 1 million persons received treatment in mental hospitals, and it is estimated that at least one person in ten has some form of mental illness that needs psychiatric treatment. Fifty percent of absenteeism in our industry is due to mental disorders of a mild or severe type. These figures can apply elsewhere in the world as well.

Add the problems of congenital malformations, immaturity in infants, the chronic and debilitating diseases of aging, the diseases peculiar to the tropics, and accidents, and one grasps the idea rather readily that education—health education—is needed the world over. There is no doubt in my mind that the most constructive thing any one person or group of persons can do presently and in the foreseeable future would be to devote his talent and energy to a program of health education in whatever land he calls his home.

We have a long way to go. It is true that education, in spite of its importance, is the most retarded in the joint effort to improve the health of people. That is most certainly true in my country. Our most recent study (*School Health*

Education Study: Summary Report of a Nationwide Study of Health Instruction in the Public Schools) has revealed not only an appalling ignorance upon the part of our school children in matters concerning health but a "marked deficiency in the quality and quantity of health education in both elementary and secondary schools." There is widespread indifference to health education among students and a great lack of specialized and consultative services. Perhaps a similar situation exists in your country. I would not know, but I do know that the first step toward any significant improvement is to appraise the status of health education at the moment in our respective communities.

Is your nation one of the very few in the world where health education is accorded a position of prominence and prestige, or does it suffer from good intentions but inadequate action on the part of the ministry of education, the school officials, or teachers themselves? In your land does health education have the dignity, the status, and command the same respect as does mathematics or literature or even music? If it does, you are fortunate. But if, in your land, it does not, then we must bend every effort to create a more favorable impression for health education. I said that in far too many places education as now organized in school and college has not accepted its responsibility to the degree the cultural influence of health education demands.[1] The knowledge and experience from the broad area of healthful living has not received the time, the dignity, or the quality of teaching personnel it requires. Our educational programs have been heavily weighted with the study about the human environment rather than about human beings themselves. There is more of an inclination to study things—bridges and bombs, rivers and rockets, or currency and customs—than the origins of human creativity or fatigue, fears and motivations, genetics, or adaptibility to family life.

It is of the greatest importance that these weaknesses in the structure of health education be removed. If, in our several countries, we find inadequacies in teaching preparation, curriculum development, or time given to health education, we can well concentrate our efforts here in order to place the health education of young and old squarely in the vortex of their educational experience, where it belongs.

What suggestions can we make for specific improvements? In the first place, it must be realized that the study of health is different from the study of mathematics or geology or almost anything else in that health education varies from place to place according to need and circumstances, whereas in mathematics two and two are four wherever you are! The goal of health education is to meet needs where they are found, and the health needs of people vary widely continent to continent, state to state, and perhaps even community to community.

Anyone whose view is other than provincial, who has seen something of this world, who has a sensitivity for people of whatever race or nationality, knows that we have barely begun to bring the full weight of medicine and public health and education to bear upon the health problems of the world. The valiant efforts of the researchers on typhus, malaria, and syphilis are matched by the heroic educational efforts of the teams from the World Health Organization and the International Union. But these are not enough, and no effort will be "enough" until health education stands next to literacy as the goal for worldwide achievement on the educational front. If one-half or two-thirds of the world's population is ill-fed, it can surely be said that nine-tenths of the people are inadequately educated in the use of science to solve their health problems.

The most important tool in the alleviation of not only health problems but *any* human problems is education. Let me illustrate. We have a serious socioeconomic problem in the United States concerning the integration of the black into our national structure. We admit the problem, and we are proud of the strides we have been making toward its solution. We started with education. In the 19th century we made our first tentative efforts, but in this century massive efforts to bring education within the reach of all are being made. The result? Wherever educational opportunities for the disadvantaged have improved, so have employment opportunities; and wherever *they* have improved, the health of blacks has improved. Disease rates have fallen, housing has improved, delinquency and violent crime has been reduced, and above all, dignity and respect have replaced the malignancy of frustration and defeat. Education is the key. Literally the whole vehicle of human progress in health or any other aspect of human life turns upon the extent to which educational opportunities are made available.[2]

To achieve worldwide literacy in matters of health, a world population educated to live in relation to modern science will require that the full weight and force of the educational structure be brought to bear in every land. Billions of dollars will have to be spent. It will have to be seen as an investment in the humanity of the future the interest on which will be payable in human values, nation by nation and state by state. We have learned already that there is no prescription for all people, but instead the educator and his ally, the physician, must be prepared not with a standard and set curriculum or a fixed program in the health services but prepared to build a program locally to fill a need as it is discovered. What we may teach in the United States about medical quackery may be wholly inappropriate in Spain, and what is taught about nutrition in Spain may not be just the thing for Mozambique.

The adaptability of health education to local conditions and needs is its greatest virtue and first requirement. The fact that Los Angeles, for example, can survey its own needs, construct its own program and, develop its own curriculum, as can Berlin or Sydney or Nigeria, is of the utmost significance. Improvement in health education comes rapidly when we quit copying from others and develop our own programs using the experience of others as helpful resource material. The adaptation of material in the 1965 UNESCO publication would be to use it well, but it was not intended to dominate the format of health education all over the world.[3] It is a resource, perhaps the most valuable one we have, to be used fully, intelligently, and resourcefully, but not copied exactly.

Health education will improve when we learn to coordinate it with community effort. Gone are the days when the school could afford to be the sanctum of learning walled off like a tubercle bacillus from the mainstream of life. We must come to realize that the school *is* the community, and the quality and kind of education received becomes meaningful and valuable to the extent that it relates to the community and the kind of life led within it. In health education this is vital.

This relation of school to community means that the school should use community resources freely. Studies can be made of food production and processing, hospital and medical facilities, the structure of medical care, the legalities involved in disease control, the nature and viability of communicable diseases in the community. These are but a few of the areas of potential study within the community into which a good educational program will delve.

Conversely, the community can be invited into the school. There is no need to be secretive or chary about relating ourselves to the local board of health, voluntary agency, international group, or local medical society. There are good people in many places whose talents can be used in a variety of ways if the school will seek them out and invite them to make their appropriate contribution to the health program. Field trips, community projects, classroom visitors, and other uses of the community should be a regular and commonplace part of the teaching approach to improved personal and public health.

But how does one find these needs, these human concerns that I am recommending to be the center of a local health education program? All you have to do is to look into the lives of your people, the way they live, how they live, what concerns they have, what problems they have as they meet the perplexities of a changing world. If we will research the child or the person at any age, interacting with environment, home, politics, church, playmates, we will find material for health education.

This point of view is related distinctly to my distrust of either tradition or, in a certain sense, authority as the arbiter of content in today's health education. I am of the opinion that no one knows of what a course of study in health education should be composed unless he has researched the sources. Divine insight will not do. Academic degrees *per se* do not provide insight. Health education is too vital, too personal, can be too meaningful to the consumer, the public, to allow anyone, in school or in the public realm, to pre-empt the right to dictate content unless research has shown conclusively the problems in need of solution. Guessing here will not work. The lofty wisdom of the distant curriculum maker will miss the mark. One builds a modern course of study out of the cloth of life, and that means one has to grub around with people to find out how they live, what they die of, what makes them ill, what their homes are like, what *they* are like, what they read and see and listen to and believe. The educator has to be as thorough in examining the patient as does the physician. Long-distance diagnosis and prescription can be fatal in both instances. Seldom have a group of educators sitting around a table pooling their ignorance come up with a good curriculum for school children or college students *unless those educators have actually done the research necessary to reveal the facts of need.*

No person will think vitally about a subject unless that subject is vital to the person. The word *vital* refers to life. Thus the teacher in health education must go where life is to find the teachable material.

Let no one get the impression, either, that we are talking about a few simple health lessons for children about washing their hands or brushing their teeth. We are talking about a body of material as massive as the physical and natural sciences put together. We are talking about the study of life—about humans, the way they live, love, and survive. In the United States we are currently spending some $6.5 million to provide alternative suggested plans for the teaching of biology. Perhaps our government may soon see fit to subsidize a similar study for curriculum development in health education. Has yours? At our national level, only the Bronfman Foundation and the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company have contributed substantial sums for a curriculum study in health education, the School Health Education Study.

No, if we take this challenge seriously, we will mobilize the whole weight of the educational establishment. We will be as much concerned with cognitive theories in health education as we are with such theories in the teaching of mathematics. We will expect the health education teacher to be as familiar with conceptual approaches and taxonomies of health education objectives as is the biologist. We will see clearly the very *personal* nature of health education, and thus we will see it as unique and as a *discipline*.

For health education is not the study of anatomy or physiology or microbiology or histology or pathology or any other such category or assemblage of knowledge. It is *health* education, with a character of its own. It may borrow from those fields—it always does—but to mistake health education for physiology, for example, is a great error. In health education these sciences are valuable sources of explanatory material to be used when needed in explanation of a problem in health education, but not in lieu of the discovery and discussion of *problems*.

The other day a student of mine was practicing a lesson in nutrition to a hypothetical group of ten-year-olds from a middle-class American community. He began by giving them a full hour on the nature of proteins and their use in the body. *Wrong!* That is physiology, not health education. If there is a living problem requiring a knowledge of protein to solve it, then that problem is discovered and thoroughly discussed first and the information about protein becomes intrinsically related to it. In that setting, physiology can be useful and accepted. In the setting in which the student taught, it was dull, uninteresting, and in all likelihood, rejected by the students. We must ask ourselves this question: just why does the general student need to study the life sciences? The answer is clear: to solve human health problems—and for no other reason. There is no virtue in locating the Fissure of Rolando in the brain unless that detail contributes to the solution of a problem. My student could better have discussed obesity, weight control, medical care, or some other recognized student concern than asked the class to learn about amino acids just for the sake of knowing amino acids.

While we are talking about methods of presentation of health material to a group of students, let me call your attention to the fact that this material does not lend itself very gracefully to convenient and formalized categories. The health teacher finds it difficult to keep some sense of order or logic in the sequence of subjects to be discussed during the course of a school year. This is because human health problems usually run into each other—an allergy may be related to anxiety and the anxiety to sexual incompetence or sexual incompetence to a genetic factor. The psyche and the soma are not distinct from each other, but related, and thus our convenient categories of "mental" health, "physical" health, "social" health are largely artificial and without basis in the actual nature of humans. When we use them, *if* we use them, we should be aware that the holistic nature of human beings does not permit their identification as entities, and thus to use them may result in further and continued confusion on the part of the student as he tries to solve his problems.

Similarly, to teach by using the recognized "systems" of the "body" can also be self-defeating. Only the anatomist is particularly concerned about identifying the circulatory "system" or the respiratory "system." The consumer, the student, really could not care less except as a matter of passing curiosity. The student wants to know why children die in infancy or what, if anything, causes a premature birth—and the nine systems taught one after the other will throw light on such human problems only by chance.

In place of these convenient but misleading or inappropriate rubrics, the health educator seeks to discover and organize the problems by function germane to the age. If there is a time to prepare for marriage, or prevent skin disease, or think through ways to meet life's demands, or learn something about home care of the sick—these are categories needing attention and recognizable by the learner. One will reinforce whatever insight one has about this matter if one will keep in mind the ultimate goals of health education: to affect favorably what humans know, what humans do, and what humans are. This is why health education is so different from other areas of study. It is because we are not content to stay with cognition, knowing we may begin there but we cannot stop there. We move on to doing, behavior, action, living. We want people to know about micro-organisms so they will do something about them so the child will live and be. Here is the vitality of health education. It deals in the last analysis with what a person *is*.

What do teachers need in order to perform well in health education? Well, what do they need in chemistry or language or physical education? They need a thorough grounding in the science and methodology of their field. Health is not something that just anyone can pick up and run with. For too long health education has been a stepchild, one that almost anyone could look after and give minimum care. Not at all. It is precisely this neglect in teacher training institutions that is responsible for the outrageous treatment health education receives at every level of education and for the appalling ignorance about health that pervades not only the masses but our highly educated intelligentsia. We cannot expect school children to learn very much if their teachers do not know very much.

The list of competencies in health education that ought to be possessed by *every* teacher is long, and the list for the special teacher of health education is even longer. If we are going to prepare biology teachers with a "major" of more than 60 semester hours in that field (as is now done in the United States), these special teachers in health education should not be expected to represent competency in the field of human growth, development, and health without a similar if not greater amount.

Here is the Achilles heel of health education, at least in my country. Vast improvement in the preparation of teachers—all teachers, not just the specialist—must be undertaken in order to take an appreciable step toward the solution of the health needs of our people. Wherever teachers are prepared, the strongest programs for their preparation could well be in the language arts and in health education. It must be hoped that some day our governments will give as many scholarships, as much subsidy, as they do now for the medical sciences and related specialties so that the sick may be restored to good health, or as they do now to those who study the physical sciences, that life may be destroyed more expeditiously!

Nothing is more certain than that health education in schools is, or should be, a continuum with life in the community. There should be a reversible flow of influence, from school to community and community to school. To secure this type of relationship, the classroom should not be expected to stand alone in the effort to produce a population informed on matters of health. Given insight and administrative skill the school can supplement the influence of the classroom by—

a. Organizing a school-community health council devoted to the discovery and solution of health problems through intelligent policy, intelligent use of personnel, and adequate subsidy.
b. Cultivating and using the resources, personnel and otherwise, in both official and nonofficial health agencies.
c. Seeking community understanding and support for all aspects of the school health program through the development of a public relations program that will carry the message to community clubs and organizations of all kinds.
d. Maintaining a program of research on needs and problems of school-age children, so not only will the program itself be kept up to date in their solution, but those who have the responsibility for supporting the program will realize its worth.
e. Using the resources of local dental, medical, psychological, nursing, and other professional organizations by including them in the program as consultants, part-time teachers, or health service personnel.
f. Making it possible for school personnel to benefit from the literature and meetings of important health organizations so as to stimulate the use of current knowledge and up-to-date practice in school health education.

Perhaps the greatest boon health education could receive would be to stimulate government to participate in the development of programs of health education in school and in the public realm. If we may assume that governments exist to further the welfare of their people, then it would follow that programs of education must be developed as a resounding force for health.

If health is defined as the quality of living that measures the degree to which the organism is able to function, anyone concerned in any way with any aspect or segment of humanity must be concerned with health as the primary condition for all human endeavor. There is no human need that supersedes it. There is no value of greater worth. There is no talent, no possession, no attribute that a person has, or can develop, which is of greater importance. There is no segment of one's wealth, no political goal toward which one aspires, no product of one's field or one's factory that can be considered of greater significance.

And all of this is true because without one's ability to function in pursuit of one's purposes, one does not attain them. Function, the function of a human seeking goals, is the fundamental dynamic in the human existence. Health education, like physical education, can always be used for national purposes. Politicians, statesmen, military leaders, and occasionally humanists and educators have nearly always sought to influence the health of the young, to make them strong and well, so that national purposes, whatever they might be, could be served. It has always been said, usually without discriminating as to purposes, that strong youth, strong people, make for a strong nation. And thus, the politician with an axe to grind, the militarist with conquest in mind, or just the humanist who wants everyone to make the most of himself, should realize that a healthy population is not merely something nice to have around but that it can be the most powerful force for peace the world has ever known. Keep people in ignorance, feed them half-truths but little food, allow them to become decimated with disease—these are the people who can be incited by the wicked propaganda of the avaricious politician. But give people knowledge, teach them how to develop life, not kill it or waste it, remake them where possible through the application of the life sciences, then there will be possibilities of living in a world at peace.

In my judgment not only is education the basic and most significant force for health, but health is the basic and most significant force for peace and the welfare of all humanity.

NOTES

1. Delbert Oberteuffer, "Health and Education—An Appraisal," *Journal of School Health* 34, no. 4, April 1964, p. 184.
2. From "An American Promise That Must Not Fail," leRoy Collins, as reported in *The Commentator*, May 13, 1965.
3. Clair E. Turner, "Planning for Health Education in Schools" UNESCO and the World Health Organization (Paris, 1965).

Philosophy and Principles of the School Health Program

The school health program of today is no longer a simple operation, nor does it bear any resemblance to its embryonic prototype of 1900 when vision and ventilation were the principal concerns of school doctors. We have come a long way in both service and instruction from those days when we naively believed that a scientific background in anatomy and physiology would prepare a school child with all that is needed to solve daily problems. It was innocently believed then that if we illuminated the geography of the alimentary canal the student would attain great nutritive success and become a paragon of protoplasmic virtue.

It is easy now to see how trusting was our faith. The history of school health education makes pleasant reading, because the program has evolved from such humble beginnings and has grown into such a giant—a giant whose scope is broad, whose activities are legion and, more important, whose results are everywhere around us. Years ago Thomas Wood studied the ventilation problem in the schools of New York; Emma Dolfinger encouraged Cho-Cho, the health clown, to leave his mark on school children; and John Sundwall and L. W. Childs, Don Gudakunst and William A. Howe, Leona Baumgartner and Ethel Perrin, and a host of others plowed their way through the uncertainties of policy and the obscurity of outcome to give us today a powerful influence in American life, a major element in American education—the modern program of school health education.

Delivered at the general session of the American School Health Association, Cleveland, Ohio, October 20, 1952.

What is this thing—school health education—the principles of which we are inclined to discuss? Is it large? Widely developed? Expensive? Or is it something small? Is it big enough for us to discern that it has a body of principle—or is, or could be, guided by philosophical considerations? The answer is obvious. No endeavor large enough to command the interest of so many people—of nurses and physicians, dentists and dental hygientists, psychiatrists and psychologists, nutritionists and home economists, physical educators and public and school health educators, school personnel and parents, legislators and congressmen—can be considered a small and inconsequential actor on our domestic stage.

We have evolved so far beyond those early efforts as to bewilder us all by the variety of things now undertaken, the millions of children now affected, and by the very real effect this program has upon the American people. A school dental clinic operates in Minneapolis. Parents contribute health histories of their children in San Francisco. Florida publishes a complete syllabus for the teaching of health information to all its children. Massachusetts perfects a vision screen. Washington widely develops tests for hearing. Oregon seeks organic development through a program of physical education. New York becomes a center for the education of the handicapped. Ohio seeks to control communicable disease. In New Mexico school nurses screen, advise, and teach to assimilate a varied population into healthy communities. What is cited here for any one state or city can be found in dozens of hundreds of others. We know from investigation that there is hardly a county in any state that does not have something going on, something developing by way of a school health program or part thereof.

This program is big and important, and there is no one here concerned who can afford not to give thoughtful attention to the principles upon which it is based, to the purposes it must serve, to the policies that must guide it. Let us look at some of these basic considerations to see if we can find any agreement as to their essentiality and any common understanding as to their application.

First, with whom are we dealing? *A modern program of school health education has its origins in the lives of people.* It does not spring from any preconceived notions of an academician that "these things should be taught because I believe they should." No such reason is adequate. Nor does it spring from the idea that if children can be given a knowledge of the structure and function of body parts they will go forth and live long and successful lives. No such position is acceptable because today it is known that such backgrounds of information function only feebly in the solution of a problem of marriage, or food selection, or anxiety. Of little avail is the knowledge that the Fissure of Rolando splits the brain, if one is truly concerned about one's ability to measure up to the social pressures of the sophomore class!

School health education goes to the individual, to the family, to the group, for the substance of its program. It seeks out the needs of people to satisfy, queries to answer, perplexities to solve. It anticipates problems by having the means to the solution ready. It helps the student meet concerns as they arise. It gives the student techniques of living better. It studies the community, the state, and the nation for its directions, revealing as such study does the health status of the people. To reveal individual needs and supply them is its principal and only important technique of development. It can justify its instructional and service aspects only as the proof of their need is demonstrable in the lives of either the student or the general public.

But what is the essential nature of this child, this pupil, this student who is the beneficiary of our efforts? What is this person like? Actually, we do not know much about him or her yet, but what little we do know makes it clear that he or she is one, an entity, a being indivisible and whole, and one who retains his or her integrated character for as long as an adverse environment will allow. This beneficiary of our handiwork is no segmented animal. This person cannot be divided into mental and physical, muscle and mind, emotion and intellect, psyche and soma. We have been told this for years. There is no substantial thread of evidence that permits us to believe the contrary but only recently are we beginning to understand that this unity has caused us to recast our concept of health and to reappraise the effects of all we do for its sake.

Health is no physical thing. It is no "state of physical well-being." It cannot be measured by pounds or feet, by dynamometers or audiometers. We cannot go around appraising the healthiest boys or girls by measuring the strength of their muscles or testing their vital capacity. Even counting their carious teeth will not describe the status, the quality, the nature of the particular organization of tissue that is a given child. We are coming to know that *health* is a word, a descriptive word, not used to describe status but to measure the degree to which the aggregate powers of an individual are able to function. "Good" health thus becomes an expression of function, as does "bad" health, and the function is not the function of the liver or the leg or the eyes or ears but the function of the totality that is a person. We must come to understand as quickly as we can that a study to test or treat the parts of an individual will throw little light on the whole, because the whole is something different from and greater than the parts.

Properly to understand and to approach the contribution of health education to the developing child and to the adult requires the study of what Andras Angyal describes as a science of the person, "a science over and above disciplines merely related to the person."[1] One could not profitably study the relation of a health experience to the development of behavior, for example, without knowing fully the physiological, anatomical, social, and psychological causes of acceptable or unacceptable behavior. Whatever is done in health education, whether it is teaching an activity for endurance, examining the mouth for dental decay, or requiring knowledge of immune processes, must be done in relation to the problem presented by that whole and individual organism. Once the organism is assumed to be a unity and not a plurality, then one applies a formulation of S. Howard Bartley and Eloise Chute: "As psychology is not rightfully handled except in the light of physiology, physiology cannot be all it ought except in the light of psychology or whatever discipline it is that provides for the personal in its logic. Operationism (in this instance health education) cannot rightly be used to justify the excursion onto tangents of interest that leave the organism fragmented into a plurality."[2] Health education is essentially an operation, a means of producing something, and thus it may neither employ, rely upon, nor use any "tangent of interest" that assumes the individual to be "a plurality," i.e., made up of several separate and unrelated systems or parts. The full measurement of value in health education is its production of good for "me" not "for my eyes" or "my weight" or "my body." In modern health education the concept of "body" disappears. So does the concept of health education as good for any fragmented part. In its place is the evaluation of the effect of health education upon the individual as a person.

What meaning does this have to you and me in our daily operations in school health programs? Well, Thomas Shaffer found it when he described this conception of how to judge the fitness of athletes for competition. His were neither quantitative nor numerical standards. Dr. Shaffer wants us to see each boy (or girl) as a whole and to judge his fitness by readiness, readiness of *all* the boy for the tests he will meet in athletics. The Joint Committee understands it when they advocate student counselors who can bring *all* the evidence from examinations, *all* the experiences from group living, *all* the intelligence from the genetic background into a collated story understandable by the child as he seeks to understand himself and not just his hearing problem. A. S. Daniels understood it when he saw his program of physical education for the atypical student, the handicapped, not as productive merely of an improved tonus in an afflicted limb or a skill to be proud of, but as having a bearing upon all of the life of that student, his acceptance of self and others, as an organic, social, and psychological improvement so inextricably involved as to defy segregation and measurement. Derryberry understands it when he seeks motives for behavior that belie knowledge already acquired. And Nyswander knows there is something yet undiscovered that will help us produce social or group action.

Francis D. Moore, the Harvard surgeon, is motivated by this concept in his research on the relation of hormones and of water, fat, and muscle to recovery from surgery. His investigations, like others in the making, are revealing new relationships of body elements.

These are all more or less related to the oneness of humans. The modern health educator is not merely screening for vision. While manipulating a

Snellen chart, the health educator is gathering evidence on visual acuity to be sure, but also exploring for personality variations related to vision. If glasses are fitted, they may do vastly more for the pupil-patient than restore 20/20 eyesight. When we can accept this concept of a person's unity in relation to what we do for health, we see that whatever we do has a bearing upon all of the person. Dental hygienists do not merely clean teeth; physicians do not simply spray for respiratory relief; and no one deals with one part of a child in isolation from all the others parts. On the contrary, the effect of each ministration is cumulative, and the educated person is the composite of all his or her experiences without necessary reference to any particular one. Acceptance of this concept strengthens our understanding that health education is the study of life and living, and only in the chapter headings can it be divided into "mental" and "physical." "Mind" and "body" disappear as recognizable realities, and in their stead comes the acknowledgement that a whole being stands before you to be dealt with in accordance with whatever contribution you can make.

We must recognize, furthermore, that *many talents are needed.* Health education is not a one-person show. There is a place in a full health program for physicians, nurses, teachers—teachers of physical education, sight saving, speech reading, home economics—psychologists, dental hygienists, dentists, social workers, immunologists, dietitians, sanitary engineers, school administrators, and some others of specialized and nonspecialized ability. The talents of all these can be used. Their counterparts from the consumers' side are, of course, the children and their parents. Little can be done without some of these key professionals; likewise little can be done without the full participation and cooperation of these consumers. A school health program is truly a huge experiment in group action aimed at the improvement of the life of a given child.

The talents must be used in an atmosphere of mutual respect and professional confidence. Success in school health education comes when each professional recognizes the worth of the contribution of the other; refuses to usurp more scope or more credit than is due; and shares in the thinking, planning, and execution necessary to get the job done. It is at this point that many school programs have wavered and some collapsed. It is not always easy to get a group of individualists to work cooperatively. Sometimes the teacher assumes far too much prerogative in the guidance of a child or, worse, discounts the efforts of others as they try to affect the life of one child in the classroom, Sometimes the physical education teacher assumes far too much in the sphere of diagnosis or fails to make use of the best of scientific information in giving health instruction. Sometimes the physician, prepared in a highly individualized professional tradition, is unable to appreciate the work of others or, worse, insists that all school health work be considered his or her private reservation and all others subject to his or her direction.

For decades the development of school health instruction has fallen to physical education teachers. Generally speaking, that group didn't ask for the task. They were given it whether they were well prepared to teach in that area or not. Historically they have seen a job to do and they have done it—often without help, often with opposition from do-nothings. The time has come to stop making this group, or any other, the whipping boy for all the mistakes made in school health education. Physical education people are getting tired of it.

Nurses are becoming more important to this program all the time. And they are becoming better educated, better prepared, and better qualified to do a responsible job in health instruction. They need a helping hand to lift them beyond the peonage that traditionally has been their lot. The idea that a nurse is vastly inferior in *every* respect to the physician is pure tommyrot, and we ought to recognize it as such. It will come hard to some who have enjoyed the perquisites of rank for so long to realize that if deference is paid to superior judgment in school health matters it must be deference paid to wisdom and to nothing else.

Local physicians and community health educators are to be welcomed into this program warmly and fully. It is a cooperative venture. It took local and state medical associations a long time to wake up to what was going on. Now they are in action with state and local committees, and their zeal should be appreciated. We should understand fully that the school health program lives not in isolation from, but is a part of the entire community problem of healthful living. In such a relationship community talent, both official and unofficial, should be used.

Boards of health and boards of education must learn to work together by agreement or contract or both in the school health program. However, it must be appreciated by everyone involved that boards of education and their appointed administrative officers, the superintendents of schools, have no desire to relinquish administrative control over any phase of school life. They are held responsible by the public for everything that goes on in the schools, and this responsibility simply cannot be preempted by boards of health.

A school health education program is an educational–not a medical–enterprise. It is not in competition with the practice of medicine. It is complementary to medicine, supports it, educates school children to patronize it, discovers individual needs for it, but does not compete with it. School health education has no aim eventually to substitute its services for those of the private physician.

There has been much misunderstanding here. There are some physicians and public health workers who have the misconception that the health interest of educators is a proprietary one. They are apprehensive lest the outcome of school health education be the destruction of the private practice of medicine and the substitution of some form of state medicine.

Three things must be said in this connection. First, there is evidence to show that where complete school health education programs have existed there is not less but more demand for the services of physicians and public health workers. Second, the school has a legitimate purpose in concerning itself with the health of the child. It realizes that education cannot go on fully and constructively unless the child is in good health. It tries not to waste public funds attempting to educate children who are unfit to receive an education. Third, to teach about health, to organize experiences pertaining to it, and to carry on education in a healthful environment are all parts of the basic purposes of a school. The school must give its students control over the means of existence, over life. Certainly learning about health and living healthfully can be considered in no other way than as a means of furthering our existence and theirs within the scope of education. There is no infringement upon the province of the physician, the hospital, or the clinic. There is, thus, no ground for lack of coordination. A school health education program deserves the cooperation of all professional personnel united to serve within it.

The school is in no position to finance extensive curative or remedial medical or dental programs at public expense. Of course, exceptions are made, but in nearly every instance the exceptions are endorsed by the medical and dental groups in the community who appreciate the fact that only through these means will the children involved be cared for properly. Principally, however, the school acts merely as an interested community agency willing to stimulate others into finding the means to do a needed piece of work for the benefit of handicapped or ailing students.

It is well recognized that there are millions of people unable financially or unprepared intellectually to seek and get medical service. The school sees their need, at least insofar as the need is expressed through the children, and is in a position to encourage social and public agencies in their efforts to bring medical aid to them.

The emphasis in school health education has moved from the mass to the individual. This is a general trend in all of education. It becomes no longer important to survey thousands of children in an annual physical examination unless within such a program each child is given thorough attention and the child's individual status and needs are discovered and dealt with adequately. Just as physical education has moved from the practice of marching thousands on the field for the same exercises given to all at the same time to a program of activities taught in small groups and in the light of individual needs, so also has school health education veered away from mass production. As Leona Baumgartner expresses it, "For school health this [means] that finding what the individual child needs and building a program to meet those needs comes first."[3]

A program of school health education should not be an object of charity. Contributions to it should not be sought on that basis. In the early days, many physicians and some nurses were asked to give their services free for examinations or screening. Others were urged to contribute books, equipment, or time. Private practitioners were asked to examine children and give the summary of their findings to the school. With rare exceptions, this charitable approach to administration has been a failure. Physicians have their professional competence to sell. Others have specialized talent that took years to develop. Such skills should be bought and paid for by the school if it expects to make good use of them. No part of the program that involves any measure of professional competence should be performed without adequate compensation.

Information about a given child must remain the confidential property of only the professional personnel concerned, the child, and the parent or guardian. This is known as the principle of privileged communication. In the early days of school health work, physicians looked with dismay upon the request of the educator for the results of the physical examinations of children. For centuries the physician has not been in the habit of giving any information about a patient to anyone save parents and other interested medical personnel. It was a restricted or priviliged relationship, *and still is.*

The principle itself is as old as the confessional. It is observed by ministers, lawyers, and physicians and must be observed by teachers if they wish to share in the confidential information possessed by physicians as a result of their examinations. When one goes to a lawyer with a legal problem, one knows that the secret will not be divulged without consent. The secrets of the confessional are not common property. A physician does not violate the confidence of the patient. This is the operation of the principle of privileged communication.

Its place in the school health program is clear enough. No one should ever make public, or make the subject of common gossip, anything about the health status of a given child. If a teacher is told that a junior high school girl has dysmenorrhea which is affecting her work, her happiness, and her social life, the fact is no one's business except the professional personnel in a position to help the girl. The whole school staff need not know it. Other children need not know it. If a boy has 20/100 vision, it is no one's business except his family, his teacher, his oculist, and himself. Teachers must learn not to gossip about what they know, not to pass on information to unauthorized, unconcerned, or irresponsible personnel. They should regard their students the way the physician regards them—as clients entitled to a high standard of professional treatment. It is suggested that in the several situations where school health programs are underdeveloped or are faltering because of misunderstandings or conflicts among the personnel, the twin problems of "diagnoses" and "priviliged communication" be looked into as probable causes of friction.

We must examine the relationship between school health education and the social and political philosophy of our people. It is basic to any phase of education that its operation must reflect and demonstrate the democratic way and have no aims or practices at variance from that culture. Now where do we stand in school health education? What are we doing? What is the end effect of the school health program upon those who come through it? Are we developing a kind of health care for our people that is only one step short of that found in a welfare state? Is school health education merely a respectable form of state medical practice—or is it truly an educational experience leading its beneficiaries into self-sufficient intelligent behavior seeking medical and dental assistance on the free-enterprise basis? We have been at this business of teaching about health for a long time now. We have discussed medical care in our classrooms, given free tests to millions, discovered dental hazards, given free lunches, screened for visual handicaps, given countless physical examinations, and dispersed volumes of advice. By so doing, are we teaching our people to expect something for nothing, to live on the taxes of the other fellow, or are we teaching people to stand on their own feet?

This is no touchy problem. This is a problem we have to meet head on and with full intelligence and insight. We have invested millions of dollars in school health work and anyone has a right to ask us about the relationship between what we are doing and the popular or unpopular political doctrines of the day.

Whatever we do in the name of school health education must meet the needs of the people. But in meeting those needs for medical care or for health advice, or for anything else, we must not destroy the capacity for self-direction and the will of the individual to look after himself and his family. The great moral virtue of our free life is to be found in our independence, in our freedom from indigency, in the greater sacredness of the individual over the state. To preserve our choices, to pay our own way, to buy and sell as we choose, to retain the honor of paying our own bills—these are some of the values within a free society. Education, all of education, must be geared to preserve these things.

We simply cannot afford to develop school health education without giving thought to the *moral* values within it. If we run a low-cost dental clinic for indigent people and a wealthy person patronizes it because it is cheaper, we have failed to develop an essential morality in that person's background. If we teach youngsters to run to their school physician for every diagnosis and treatment because it will be free, we are destroying something important in our culture. We simply cannot put on vision demonstrations, test thousands for hearing, do mass tuberculosis screening, immunize people by the millions at public expense, without dealing at the same time with the effect of these activities on private medical practice.

We do these things in school not for clinical or reparative reasons but primarily to demonstrate and to educate. In some instances we can justify our activities on the grounds of public protection and in others because education cannot go on economically unless they are done. The practices we undertake in school health education should never undermine our evolving conception of medical and dental care. They should be undertaken in such form and with such discipline as to support it.

But we must be consistent. Needs must be met. One way or another, the needs of the people must and will be met. No one stands for long in the way of an aroused people. We will have appropriate medical and dental care in this country before this century is out, but in having it we must somehow preserve our independence, our self-respect, and our freedom of choice. Schools are morally culpable if they turn our medical practice into state practice.

American school children have the right to the best that science can offer to aid in their development. The nation has the right to expect that we who are strategically placed to aid them in this development will bring every advantage to them. If research in human anthropology shows a positive relation between nutritional states and juvenile delinquency, it behooves us to organize nutritional programs of service and instruction that will temper, at least, this cause of the moral degeneration of youth. If an adverse environment means epidemics of hurtful agents, then the school as a social institution must accept its responsibility to serve as a medium through which such debilitating factors may be obviated. If in a democracy we rely upon a high level of literacy as a means of preserving that way of living, then familiarity with the place of science as a benefactor of life must be one of the literacies. It is good but not sufficient that educated people know of the historical, philosophical, or individual advances of the race. They must know also of the great march of science as it has secured life for humanity. We must understand that to preserve life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness requires organic and psychological soundness as much as it does political and social freedom. The nation will thrive only by having strong, well, and informed people living within it.

Thus school health education becomes not merely a bulwark of our culture, but a moving force within it. A full acknowledgement of these principles translated into a working program will go far in aiding in the development of children everywhere.

NOTES

1. Andras Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (Commonwealth Fund, 1941), chap. 1.
2. From *Fatigue and Impairment in Man*, S. H. Bartley and E. Chute (Courtesy of McGraw-Hill, New York, 1947), p. 47.
3. Leona Baumgartner, "Some Phases of School Health Services," *American Journal of Public Health*, June 1946, p. 631.

Health as Motivation

Health itself is not as good a motivating factor as we would like to believe. We have become accustomed to appealing to young and old alike to do or not to do this and that "for the sake of your health." The admonition that something is "good for your health" is used indiscriminately to get children to go to bed, to eat their cereal, or to wear their overcoats. Many appeals are made in the name of health. Advertising channels use it liberally for sprays and soap, for mattresses and automobiles. The health of the nation is well solicited. One is urged on every hand to protect one's health against the many dangers besetting it.

Using health as a motive, however, is a dubious practice. In the first place, the concept of health is essentially a generalization and thus not well understood. Few people will do things for reasons they do not understand or understand poorly.

Health should be presented in its true light as a means to an end rather than as an end. Health is a tool to be used. Only to the sick and the hypochondriacal does it become an objective. To the well it is something to use, to spend, to rely on through life. It is expendable in the sense that it is there to be used in the attainment of life's purposes. As Williams has expressed it many times, health is not mass, but function. It is not something to husband but something to spend, although it is not to be wasted. Good health is a condition of the organism to be used in attaining one's goals. It should be used freely. Whenever the teacher sets health as an end in competition with other ends, health will frequently come out second best. Many are willing to attain the other objective and let a little health go for the moment. Let the teacher show, however, that the performance of "health" activities will contribute to the success of the ends in view (i.e., sleep tonight will assure a better game tomorrow) and there is a better chance of getting the sleep.

Health as a motivator is likewise of doubtful value because of the hazard of making hypochondriacs out of people. There are millions seeking alibis for failures, millions who yearn to be the center of the stage for even a fleeting moment, millions who crave sympathy and affection. To these their health is a sure thing. Teach them to guard it, do things or avoid things because of it, make them "health conscious," drum "health" into them from infancy, and they develop the morbid interest in it characteristic of the hypochondriac, the quack, the faker, the bore. Health becomes a crutch, an excuse, an all-absorbing fetish. These people excuse failure because of poor health. They have no claim to glory but know that the recitation of symptoms will get an audience any time. They claim their share of sympathy with a vengeance.

These are too frequently the results of urging people to do things "because they are good for your health." It is much better to find the reason for doing the thing in the direct result of its doing. Health as a word and as a motive should be used sparingly if at all in teaching about it. There are excellent reasons for getting sleep, being vaccinated, and eating well. They need not be obscured by using the single general term "health."

To teach people to be "health conscious" is a doubtful practice, because the great physiological processes go on best without interference from the psyche. The loss of self-consciousness is desirable for the sake of one's effective functioning. This means that the teacher of health must see that the interest in learning about health matters is transferred from the self to the idea or activity that would be the beneficiary of the knowledge learned. For example, one would transfer the interest in active recreation away from doing it "for one's health" to playing golf or tennis for the fun of it or for the sake of being with friends. The West Pointer maintains a rigid posture not by concentrating on the position of his visceral organs but by attempting a bodily reflection of an ideal of the Service. One seldom plays golf for health's sake, and to play tennis for "exercise" is suitable only for those who (a) must actively seek such therapy in convalescence or (b) must find an excuse for their love of golf and tennis.

There are times, however, when it is desirable to think consciously and act overtly in terms of health. We would want the camper to boil or chlorinate his water on purpose to prevent disease. We would want children deliberately to give up the old swimming hole because its water is filled with B. coli, and we would want any persons with early symptoms of an ailment to be introspective enough and to know enough to call a physician for aid. Sometimes we have to act consciously about our health, and it thus becomes the responsibility of the teacher to give enough information describing the consequences of our acts to allow the learner to make intelligent choices. Health conduct is, after all, largely a matter of choices. We choose to smoke or not to smoke, to go to sleep or to stay up another two hours, to seek an early diagnosis or to wait a couple of months to see what develops, to eat this or that, to cross in the middle of the block or to go to the corner. The selection is the student's . It is the student's life, welfare, and happiness at stake. *The business of the teacher is to provide the student with the data to help make these choices.*

Thus to get everyone to ''take a conscious interest in one's health'' can be badly overdone from several points of view. It can lead to a morbid interest in health. It can interfere with physiological function. It can serve as a spurious reason for doing an otherwise reputable thing. At the same time students must be taught to handle reasons, facts, points of view, and data in such a way as to be prepared to make an obvious and important choice when serious matters are at stake.

Some Things We Need and Some Things We Do Not Need in Sex Education

I liked the comment by W. G. Rogers, reviewing the recent memoir by Lillian Hellman, *An Unfinished Woman:* "A peculiar conceit of every generation—it may be the distinguishing conceit of the callow newcomers as they swarm up among us decade after decade—is that it discovered sex. This is one of the attitudes that render the young dull, incredible and amusing. In the flamboyant and boastful Sixties, however, thanks in part to the pill, the newcomers, rank upon rank, have reached further heights of arrogance. They lay out exclusive claims to the fullest, freest and busiest sex ever: like no one else in history, they are truly emancipated." [1]

But not so! What any new crop of young ones needs to understand is that much of what they do we have always done. Exploration, promiscuity, fun and games have always been with us. So has need—for counsel and information. And likewise has fear—fear that if the young were taught well, enlightened about the mechanisms of the sex life, they would go to hell promptly and effectively. There always have been critics of the educator's efforts to

---

Delivered at the Joint Session of the American School Health Education and the School Health Section of the American Public Health Association at their annual meetings in Philadelphia, November 14, 1969.

Although the responsibility for what has been said in this paper belongs entirely to the author, he has been aided by such professional friends as Robert Kaplan, Wesley P. Cushman, Elena M. Sliepcevich, Marion Pollock, H. S. Hoyman, Ann E. Nolte, E. J. McClendon, Wilfred Sutton, Charles Richardson, Marian Hamburg, and Stanley W. Ellis.

inform—nasty, bigoted critics such as those who are spreading fear and suspicion today—those self-righteous accusers who get on their radios and write their pamphlets to scare nice parents to death with the spectre of ivory-toothed teachers leading their innocent mini-skirted virgins down the primrose path.

I get a little tired—but remain tolerant—of those who belabor the generation gap. Maybe there is one somewhere, but in sex education there's just a gap. It has always been with us—a gap between need and answer, between preparation and realization. Hasn't anyone ever read Oscar Wilde or Thomas Wolfe? Don't those fearful critics of ours, who must suffer such tortures themselves as to blind them to the nature of sex in normal life, know their social history? Haven't they read *Fanny Hill* or Homer or Thucydides, or seen *Lysistrata,* or heard of Plato or Euphonius? Both the youngster of today and the protective critic who would keep children perpetually in ignorant bondage must come to realize (but they never will) that there are no new problems, no new needs, and very little new information at the disposal of the educator.

Can we really say there has been a recent acceleration of interest on the part of young people in this area of their lives? I doubt it. Early studies in this century in Oregon, Ohio, Denver, and California showed students quite willing to state their concerns. One can easily gather that the young people in the 19th century had problems and interests largely unmet in any formal way in education. What we have today that we did not have before is a current willingness and enthusisam on the part of teachers working in organized curriculum settings to get at some of these student problems and deal with them on a constructive, scientific basis. The decade 1960-70 has seen a lot of change in the number of schools willing to do some teaching in this area. The result has been the production of some outstanding teaching materials for use at every level. Advance here has been prodigious. The production of good books, teaching outlines, films, and other paraphernalia to aid the teacher has been almost more than we need. The college teacher no longer has to rely only upon Emslie Hutton's *Hygiene of Marriage* and a couple of pamphlets on venereal disease by the American Social Hygiene Association. Today the woods are full of excellent paperback and hardback resources.

To mention just a few: If one were to examine the teaching materials for Concept 6, "The Family Serves to Perpetuate Man and to Fulfill Certain Health Needs," prepared in 1969 by The School Health Education Study, one would find excellent teaching suggestions for all grades;[2] or the 36-page paperback *Growth Patterns and Sex Education* (a suggested graded outline) published by the American School Health Association in 1967;[3] or the Study Guides from the Sex Information and Education Council (SIECUS);[4] or some of the state courses of study such as those from California, Connecticut, New York, and a half dozen other equally good ones; or such publications as Helen

Manley's *A Curriculum Guide in Sex Education*[5] and Esther Schulz and Sally Williams' *Family Life and Sex Education.*[6] One would gather from these efforts a sound impression of their integrity and the conscience with which the educator is taking the responsibility to do something in the sphere of family life and sex education. The SIECUS newsletter alone lists enough good resources to keep anyone busy for a lifetime just reading the material as it comes out.

But 'twas ever thus: Every time we, in education, rise to meet a problem there are others from both within and outside the profession who try to knock us down. From Idaho and New York, California and Ohio, Kentucky and Pennsylvania, from all over the land of the free come efforts to control, restrict, or abolish sex education courses—an avalanche, a flood of opposition. Probably nothing has so stirred the antis since the Rugg textbook controversy spearheaded by the American Legion 30 years ago. It's a riot, and just as terrifying as Watts or Chicago; terrifying because of the realization that we really haven't come very far from the days of the Salem witch hunt. If we had, what would Dan Smoot or "Dr." Drake or the John Birch Society do for a living?

But good sense must and will prevail, provided we see clearly our needs and recognize equally clearly some things we don't need. Let me suggest several of these.

1. *We need to know what we are doing*. Strangely enough, lots of people do not. They just stumble and bumble into and across this volatile area, teaching little more than the mechanisms and geography of the reproductive system. We need to know that delving into this area gives the teacher an opportunity to organize a rich educationl experience, exploring the most significant and important aspect of life. From childhood to old age humans have their problems—both personal and social—as they try to adjust themselves to a society with moral standards proscribing sexual activity. Good teaching, thus, must become more than the transmission of static knowledge that has no relevance to ongoing problems.

To affect behavior and to produce development are, in the long run, the principal goals of sex education, and to achieve these, much more than the anatomy of the parts is needed. We need to help in the resolution of the perplexities and mysteries of individual sexuality in childhood and old age and all ages in between. The person who says he or she has no problems, or no unresolved curiosities, or to whom all mystery has been stripped away, either deliberately prevaricates or is just insensitive or unaware. It is good to have help in how to adjust to the ramifications of sex in life at age 16 or 26 or 50, and if school counselors or teachers or school physicians can help, we call that sex education. It is good to be knowledgeable about pregnancy or less than terrified at the first nocturnal emission or to be supported by standards and values as one feels the first temptation to do what seems to come naturally. It is good to know some things about the social problems of child neglect, child abuse and abandonment, illegitimacy and abortion. Discussion in these areas is within the broad scope of sex education. *Life* (June 13, 1969) devotes practically a whole issue to "Science and Sex in the New Morality."

How can anyone in his right mind fail to encourage schools to dig into this area so our young people will be prepared to act, to vote, to counsel their own children on these and other matters? To discuss such problems as predetermination of sex, designing offspring for special jobs and environments, the use of artificial insemination, generation without sperm or egg, the causes and prevention of divorce, the biological origins (or lack of them) in our religious or moral codes—these are all a part of sex education, and we ought to be dealing with these matters if we are not now. Teach about birth control, the population explosion, contraception? How can we miss as long as we know enough to stay within the existing legal boundaries and have the sense to recognize the existing but important community limits for such discussions? Who is going to prepare the ongoing generation to understand contraception so thoroughly that when the day comes when contraception is so cheap, so easy to prevent any risk of unwanted pregnancy, the youngsters will know how and why to act—single or married? I doubt whether the membership of the John Birch Society or seven eighths of the parents will be able to do this kind of teaching unless they get help from teachers, nurses, physicians, or other well prepared counselors.

Actually, there is so much to embrace, so much to talk about, so much to learn, to understand, that the teacher must simply read, study, and develop his or her own understanding far beyond any dilettante's efforts to teach little children where babies come from or to promise adolescent girls what kissing may lead to. The needs are clear, resounding, unmistakable, personal, and compelling.

2. *To know what we are doing requires that we know more than the needs people have for information and counsel.* We have to understand that teaching in this area is inescapably related to the great religious doctrines of every culture to be found in our pluralistic society. We may think we can teach sex education without being concerned about the Christian doctrines relating to chastity, monogamy, or divorce, or the Judaic or Moslem or any other religious admonitions about modesty or privacy or marriage customs—but we cannot. We cannot bring a discussion of boy-girl relationships or homosexuality or the nomenclature of the sexual organs out of the pages of a textbook, assign them to a class, and not be expected to relate to 15 or 20 centuries of religious and moral background. We must never forget that for most of our people church and family are stronger influences than school—at least in such a personal area as sex—and to ignore this strength is to invite trouble.

I remember very clearly a conversation I had 40 years ago with the director of public health in Ohio. He was a staunch Roman Catholic. I was seeking his endorsement of a plan to certify nurses as teachers in health education if they chose that course of preparation. The idea was new to him, and he wanted to know what in the world nurses would teach in a classroom. I mentioned the usual areas, and when I suggested they might teach something about sex he exploded. "Young man," said he, "no one except parents or priests should ever teach *any* child *anything* about sex."

Well, that is not an accurate reflection today of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, but there was an encyclical produced by Pope Pius XI in 1929 that still more or less sets the boundaries for Catholic acceptance in this area. There is no use being unaware of that in particular or the attitude of the Church in general toward our efforts.

Our society seems to want to preserve chastity in the young. We want them to come to the marriage bed with no previous experience in sexual intercourse. We want them, once married, to stay married. Divorce is not yet a popular and wholly acceptable way to solve problems. And we do not yet condone adultery. Does a program of sex education contribute to the preservation of these three cultural objectives or doesn't it? Some say of course it does. Some say it doesn't. Which paper do you read? But if someone gets an idea that sex education will lead to the destruction of any or all of these three basic moralities there will be some—maybe many—in our communities who will call us to task. We have to know what we are doing and be able to come reasonably close to proving that we do it.

These three cultural objectives—chastity, monogamy, and the everlasting marriage—are the most deeply rooted patterns in our society. They are rocks upon which our society is built. They involve our whole concept of family, and our version of the family is the basis for our civilized society. We are not Samoans or Kenya tribesmen or even Frenchmen. We are what we are, with a heritage of puritanical reverence for the word of God, and His word is still a dominant force in the dynamics of our daily—and nightly—lives. We are not yet as hedonistic as the Romans.

Read Matthew 19:4 on divorce. Read the Sex—Sex Behavior entry in the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* Volume 4, page 297. Here are the strong origins of our cultural attitudes toward sexual behavior. Read the Torah. Read Leviticus. It is not easy to find Biblical proof, but if you will hunt, you will find the admonitions that relate to our efforts—and we will never be wholly successful if we separate our teaching from the great concepts of love, morality, reverence, and home. This setting has to be the backdrop against which we teach. Anything else relates only to animal behavior. A bibliography of good religious works is as important to us as a Bowman[7] or a McCary.[8] Have you read Dean Robert Capon's *Dead and Board?*[9] That is a good book on marriage in general and as important as Bowman's *Marriage for Moderns* anytime. And then there is the scholarly work of Derrick Sherwin Bailey on the *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought*.[10] Such books are important background reading for anyone dealing with sex education.

The pendulum may be swinging toward a more permissive attitude toward sexual behavior. Tom Jones may yet prevail over Billy Graham, but getting rid of hypocrisy in sex does not necessarily mean freedom from restraint. Restraint, chastity, or monogamy may well be self-selected and self-imposed for good reasons, and argumentation on these points is as much a part of sex education, if not more so, as teaching about contraception. The toughest and most difficult question I ever had put to me in a class in health education was the one asked by a freshman who wanted to know whether there was a biological base for either the Christian or Jewish codes of sexual morality. He could not see his sex life in isolation from his approach to life itself and was seeking wholeness as he faced his own personal problems. I had to know something about the Christian and Jewish codes of morality to satisfy him.

3. *We need to know also that we are helping our students meet the so-called new morality*. They have problems. There is nothing new about the problems, just more of them and affecting more young people because there are more young people. As the old Down-Easterner said: he's not sure there is any more or different hanky-panky going on today than in his day, but he's just mad because there's a different crowd doing it!

Time for July 11, 1969, tells a pretty good story of what is happening on stage and in movies and the press and bookstalls of today. Surely young people will not be able to escape the continued influence of all of these forces. We must know what these forces are so as to be able to meet them. *Desire Under the Elms* set tongues wagging for years, four decades ago. Eugene O'Neill was an evil force in the estimation of many. Theda Bara was not an unexciting person on the screen, and now we have *Oh, Calcutta!* and Vanessa Redgrave and the Living Theater and *I, a Woman* and the comic innuendos of Tommy and Dick Smothers and Rowan and Martin and the "pornos." Are these signs of a civilization falling apart?

If the Supreme Court has trouble defining pornography, if censorship of entertainment is disappearing, if local groups don't know what smut is or isn't where does that leave the lively adolescent? And us? It leaves the adolescent at the point of searching for values in decision-making—about his or her own behavior. Do I or don't I? How far do *I* go? The outdoor movie or the overnight beach picnic or the love-in may be the proving ground. Decisions have to be made and it is our job to help these young people make them, not by taking out of cold storage some unrelated fact about the vas deferens and its tributaries but by relating, if necessary, that choice morsel of information to the whole jigsaw puzzle of values, ideals, appetities, capabilities, hazards, and all the other components of the self-seeking solutions.

4. *We need to know that we are teaching everybody.* In this day of high mobility in our population we are likely to have everybody in any given class—the rich and the poor, the well and sick, the genetically favored and the genetically handicapped. We will have children from every religion, color, and educational background. We will have the 200,000 youngsters who come before our courts every year. We will have the half million with psychomotor irregularities. What kind of sex education will they receive?

We will have the 10 million hungry youngsters, the 7 million whose life expectancy is shortened by disease and despair. We will have the youngsters—4 million of them—who will become our problem drinkers. Does sex education have anything to do with these people? And still these mad critics want us to keep hands off sex education because it is something only for the home and church! How evasive of reality can they get?

But mainly we will have the 40 percent of all children who drop out before their 12 years of school are finished. Why do they? Because our contemporary programs of education do not motivate them to stay in school. And part of our failure is the absence of just such an area of study as we are talking about—an area that might give a little more meaning to life and cultivate a bit more of the self-respect so badly needed by these dropouts. We teach everybody—and no one sex education curriculum in the world will fit them all. We need variation in content, approach, and style to do this job right.

5. *We need to know that in developing sex education as a part of a broad program of health education, we are not only shattering an old liberal arts tradition but we are scaring some of our fellow educators to death!* I cannot resist saying once again that although our colleges and universities and thus our high schools have made heroic attempts to study man and his society, man and his environment, man and his technology, they have been very chary about studying man himself. *The Lonely Crowd* is insightful and the darling of sociology departments. Thomas Wolfe is given a thorough treatment in classes in American literature, but somehow the response to our request to deal well with cancer and nutrition or the effect of this sedentary life or to talk about sexuality is usually less than we would want. Tradition has it that we can talk of humans in relations to their world but not about humans themselves. Don't get personal—and what is more personal than sex? So we need to know that we get less support than we would hope for from our deans and principals because they

are frightened of breaking new ground—especially with such a sharp shovel as sex education.

If these are some of the things we need, what are some of the things we don't need?

1. *I am not sure we need any more animals to help us in our teaching.* Our zoo is pretty full as it is. Some very earnest writers the other day told us of the use of ducks, dogs, fish, turtles, kangaroos, and birds in teaching kindergarten children about the beginning of life. And we have made plentiful use of cows, horses, rabbits, elephants, guppies—the whole bit—in order to help the young understand what daddy does to mommy and where little sister came from.

Well, I wonder. Perhaps I was brought up in the wrong generation—the one that had Robert Benchley wondering out loud just what the advantages were of sending city kids to the farm to observe the copulation process of horses. Are farm families happier because they know these animal facts? Is the divorce rate lower? Are farm husbands more faithful? Is there less promiscuity among farm children? Less voyeurism? Fewer unwanted pregnancies? Are the ingredients of an enduring marriage to be found in the barnyard? Or the animal cage? What are the facts? Does it really help to raise animals in the classroom?

Or is this animal approach merely a stall—a way to spend some time dodging around the real and delicate issues involved in *human* relations? What does this use of zoological phenomena have to do with friendship, decency, morals, devotion, chastity, and love? Is family life education and homemaking among human beings advanced by watching the male birds bring home the provender to feed the hungry mouths of the young? I am particularly repelled by the filth in the homes of a few families of purple martins whose nest I clean out each year so that the next crowd in can soil them up in their own way!

I am not sure at all what the activities of bulls or stallions contribute to the marriage bed. I have a hunch something else is needed here. I don't think we need the animal-bird-guppy approach to sex education, and as parent and teacher, I doubt I ever will.

2. *Nor do we need an indiscriminate use of descriptions of the anatomy and physiology of human reproduction.* Discriminating use—yes. And there is only one clue to discrimination—anatomical and physiological detail is never of any avail except as it is needed to explain a problem or question or contribute to understanding of function. The chapter in the text ought not to begin with the anatomy of parts.

Anatomy and physiology without relevance to interest, curiosities, or problems are like what speed reading is to contemplative understanding of a page. They do not provide the beauty of the line or the melody of thought. Learning about the ovarian capsule or the prostate gland may or may not have any relation to a living experience. A good teacher is concerned about affecting living experience and not about the accumulation of knowledge for its own sake. Anatomy and structure are useful only as explanation of function. Modern architects know this; so do space pilots. Why don't we?

It is because many of us have developed an unwholesome and unshakable reverence for the sanctity of subject matter. Any suggestion that part of anatomy or physiology of the human body be omitted tends to be treated as heresy. The fullness of the course and its value are defended by teachers who point proudly to the tough questions that are used to test knowledge at the end of the course. Far too many of our health education courses are crammed with a superabundance of uncorrelated facts, at least in the mind of the student who takes the course.

Generally speaking, no teacher can teach and no student can absorb in one year or one semester such an overwhelming avalanche of material together with its conceptual connections. This fact, of course, does not escape perceptive teachers. They use, therefore, the inductive method which they regard as essential to the learning procedure. They seek problems and develop demonstrations, lectures, and discussions to assist students in solving these problems. They help students relate and correlate their facts and then assist them to develop a generalization or concept so that the facts are illuminated by the light of principles. This inductive method has the advantage of getting right at the problems that are real, cogent, and germane to the lives of students. The only flaw in this method is clearly seen when teachers become so busy that they are unable to take the time at the end of a sub-area in health education to develop the conceptual illumination so necessary to bring the whole thing together and build it in as a significant part of one's well-structured concept of life itself.

3. *Nor do we need evasion of these problems.* The contemporary scene must be dealt with. If a child wants to know where babies come from, he should be told accurately now, and with love, or he'll not be happy with his information when he does find it out. The stork and other pleasant evasive myths were fine in their time, but their time has passed. We just don't need people who drag their feet and resist appropriate curriculum developments.

4. *We don't need people who accuse the health educator of everything from immorality to homosexuality if he or she tries to help some student develop decision-making capabilities.* Nor do we need those who punish or ostracize or in other ways make life difficult for young ones with problems—like refusing to let girls come back to school after delivery of their baby or looking down our

snobbish academic noses if youngsters want us to tell the truth instead of evading questions. Students do not need to be sent out of the room if they use a bad word. They need to be helped to understand why the word is not in acceptable usage and the circumstances, if any, under which it is. Youngsters need an open door somewhere, a door that will lead to scientific decent counseling, but on their terms and dealing with their problems as imposed upon them by the world in which they live. We do not need teachers, principals, board members, or citizens in the community who are cowards or insensitive or unaware of today's problems wherever they are and from whatever segment of society they come.

5. *Another thing we do not need, and I am sure you will all agree to this one, is poorly prepared personnel in charge of these programs.* Sex education is one of those areas where several different kinds of people get involved. Sex education is not like physics or chemistry or mathematics, for which people seldom claim competency unless they have been professionally prepared. Strangely enough, almost anybody—the local barber, the businessman, the minister, the minister's wife, the butcher, the baker, or the candlestick maker can talk with seeming authority about weight control, cold remedies, or the propriety of sex education. These areas seem to be victims of enthusiastic ignorance on the part of many people. We would hope for at least a reasonable measure of competence on the part of anyone who would presume to accept some responsibility for teaching others in this area.

In the first and last analysis, parents have the key to the whole thing. There is absolutely no use for parent groups to get all stirred up for fear someone is going to usurp their prerogative in sex education. Inevitably parents have the first word, and both by word-of-mouth and by example most children are indelibly affected by what goes on at home.

Parents have such obvious responsibility that I only wish they would all accept it and equally well. From infancy on, what is learned about modesty, sex differences, family relationships, heredity, love, restraint, dress, chastity, promiscuity, morals, romance, marriage, and the whole gamut of values and facts has its origin at home. There is transmitted for the first time and from the diaper stage forward the powerful cultural values and practices that we propose in sex education to clarify, supplement, modify, or deny.

Wouldn't it be fine if all parents knew enough not to talk from their own personal experience as if those experiences were reliable criteria for the sexual life of all others? You know, mother may have had a bad experience as a girl, never improved upon it in marriage, know nothing of the ecstasy but only the agony, and thus pass on her experience to her daughter as typical. Or father may have been a virgin at marriage and so frightened still that he clams up on Junior, who then falls victim to the local nudity cult or somehow struggles through to his own marriage feeling no concern for the element of beauty or compassion in the sex life. If somehow we could persuade everyone, particularly parents, priests, and teachers, that they have no business talking only from personal experience but must supplement that experience by reading and study of the scientific literature of the field, children would be better off. Parent groups, such as child study leagues and men's study groups, could well devote constructive programs to reading and discussion of some of the fine literature for parents now available. Personal experience alone is not enough.

In this context, one would certainly encourage the development of the so-called marriage course at the college level as well as any course at any level where sex education plays a part. Those who go to college will become informed in this area before they become parents, and they may be in a better position, therefore, to discharge their responsibilities. Otherwise, I would personally doubt the wisdom of leaving this whole area to parents and denying the school its opportunity to make its effort to dispel the massive accumulation of ignorance, folklore, fear, and fallacy that now gets in the way of some rational understanding of sex as a function of life.

Ministers? Not if all they have is Divine Revelation! Something more is needed. These people are in key spots with certain large segments of our population. They are the purveyors, the architects, of our moral values. They can influence children tremendously. Through work with adolescents they can make or break many a confused, bewildered, and searching young one. Don't underestimate their place or their influence.

But I wish they were better prepared to fulfill their correlative mission in this area. I wish the local preacher were not so ready to jump on the bandwagon in criticism of school efforts. Some of them seem to know so much! I saw one of those abusive anti-sex education booklets the other day, from New England. Only four names appeared to be backing it, and they were all ministers! Ministers all over the country are in the act of objecting to our effort, when actually they ought to know more about what we are doing and be supportive with the whole power of their office.

It is, therefore, reassuring to hear of the efforts some denominations are planning to advance the education of their ministers through workshops, institutes, and reading courses. The more of this the better. If the clergy is to participate as counselors or teachers in this area, every one of them from the bishop down to the circuit-riding preacher out in the boondocks must have solid preparation in the area. Unfortunately, divinity schools have been just like most schools of education—sublimely indifferent to the needs of their clients in this area.

As for the certified school teachers, there are so many of them who relate to sex education. Almost all of them. Can you think of any who do not? But mainly we think of classroom elementary teachers, health education teachers, physical education, science, biology, home economics teachers, and nurses. I would not know how to appraise the level of competency of all of these people in this area. All I know is that I agree with H. S. Hoyman when he says emphatically that we are not preparing enough teachers to meet the need.[11] Hoyman says we are highly vulnerable here, and the antis are attacking us at this weak spot. How right he is! Right now we are paying the price for 50 years of lethargy on the part of state departments of public instruction and colleges of education. Go back before World War I and to the 1920s. In those days such people as Thomas Wood and Maurice Bigelow urged strenuously the preparation of teachers not only in sex education but in health education as a whole. But the response has been somewhat less than the response mathematics and science education enjoyed after Sputnik!

What we need in 1970 to meet not just the needs of young people in sex education but in the whole field of health education is *everything*. We need, as Elena Sliepcevich pointed out in 1963, recognition and subsidy from the federal government for the preparation of teachers in health education.[12] Science teachers cannot take over all there is to be taught in health education. They are too busy with other things. So are home economics teachers. We need from Congress and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a substantial, solid, meaningful recognition of health education as a professional area in education commensurate with its value. We need thousands of teachers prepared in this area, and Congress and the Executive Branch must help. We need state departments that will develop health education as a "solid" subject and take it forever out of its ridiculous category as a "special" one. Look at the experience in New York and Connecticut and perhaps elsewhere. There the legislatures made health education mandatory, and schools in the three or whatever years of grace they have to find teachers and purposeful curriculums have been frantically but constructively meeting their anticipated situation. The federal government could help if it would. (And we are grateful to those who have been helping to get tangible recognition for health education from the government. I refer particularly to the staff of the School Health Education Study and to the staff of AAHPER and of AASA.)

But mainly we need continuous and strenuous effort at the level of the state departments of public instruction. I have always thought that there was the epicenter of our problem. There the certification standards are developed and enforced. There curriculums are recommended—some of them mandated; there credits for graduation from approved high schools are stipulated. There the alleged differences between special and solid, academic and nonacademic courses are perpetuated. There the rivalries among the various areas of learning are intense. There health education in most places unfortunately comes off second best. Too bad. But not all is dreary. There are bright spots where our efforts have borne fruit and health education is emerging in full dignity and status. In 1970 we need a continuation of this effort. We need laws either permissive or mandatory inserting health education into every grade level to rank in importance with English and mathematics. We need teachable curriculums for local use, and we need well qualified teachers at every level.

State departments of education are crucial here, but running a close second are the sources of teachers and administrators—our college departments of education. I could write a book about our college departments of education and the people who run them. There are some excellent ones with a willingness and farseeing programs to meet needs. And then there are some, perhaps the majority, who are unmindful, stubborn, and lethargic in the face of our pleas to do something by way of preparing teachers and administrators in health education or to improve what they are already doing. The youngsters coming along in college need more than a little three-hour course to cover the whole field of health education. To handle mathematics adequately they get 15 or 20 such credits in some places. Is the binomial theory more useful or important than an understanding of adolescent love? The physical science studies sometimes draw 10 or 12 preparatory hours. Rocks on the moon more crucial a study than rocks in the head? Correspondence with Drs. Pollock and Sliepcevich of the School Health Education Study confirms the impression that there are not enough qualified health teachers to meet the need, and the most urgent need in teacher preparation is for better preparation in the general field of health education for prospective elementary and secondary teachers. Many colleges and universities do not provide teaching candidates with even a basic health course. So it is perfectly true that we have hundreds of elementary and secondary school teachers going into the field every year not knowing a thing about health education or its various components.

Furthermore, the day is rapidly passing when we can leave such a significant area as health education to the joint ministrations of an earnest student who has a major in both health education and physical education. Health education has emerged as a recognized field of its own, and it needs all the attention anybody can give it.

And by all means we need curriculum directors, principals, and superintendents with enough knowledge and perception of the significance of health education and its noisy member of the family, sex education, to present the case in legislative hearings, board meetings, before community groups, and even before their own staffs. There is no more justification for a curriculum director or school superintendent to plead innocence and ignorance about health education than to plead that way about the social studies or the physical sciences. It is about time graduate schools of education from Harvard to Stanford opened their eyes a bit and incorporated into their rather highly developed curriculums for school administrators some consideration of the health problems of our population and what organized education can do about them.

As for the others—physicians, nurses, counselors—obviously they all have a part to play. Science can provide an understanding of life and its processes. Physicians can provide the valuable intimate counseling of patient to doctor and sometimes a good school presentation as a resource person with student and parent groups. Nurses can make the same contribution well prepared teachers can make, if the nurse is a well prepared teacher. A nurse's counseling and resource services in sex education are more valuable than a lot of people realize.

There are some other things we do not need, too. In the last analysis, I suppose we can judge the quality of teaching in this area by its accuracy—and its good taste. To many parents and to a lot of children, any public discussion of sex is offensive. We have to remember that not everywhere are we as permissive as we seem to be on Broadway, in Hollywood, or in slick print. We have thousands of schools where the children are brought up carefully and conservatively and to whom four-letter words, descriptions of the sex act, of birth, of the terminology of sex and reproduction are not well accepted. So when a university professor gets splashed all over a popular news magazine extolling the novelty of his approach to sex education by having the students name the sex organs out loud, people have every right to raise their eyebrows. Bad taste. Flamboyant. Unnecessary. We do not need to have children sent home with questionnaires inquiring into their parents' sex life. Bad taste. Let us leave that to the Kinsey Foundation and others. Nor do we need to say that to indoctrinate children with a set of rigid rules and ready-made formulas is doomed to failure. That is asking for trouble unnecessarily. We do not need the four-letter words in class, even though there are some of us who argue for the use of the idiom as a way to foster good teaching. As of now, the use of four-letter words is still poor taste. We do not need some of the starkly realistic documentaries we show to all our students. We do not need teachers to assign drawing or modeling of genitals. We do not need graphic descriptions of copulation. We should remember that in the schoolroom we cannot do it all—that students do have family, friends, and many have ministers and physicians who can help to educate them. We can be a little more conservative—not quite so enthusiastic—and still perform our function very well indeed.

6. *We do not need inaccuracy, guesswork, folklore, superstition, or ignorance*. Teachers who do not know an IUD from the pill and never heard of silastic had better back away from the contraception problem until they catch up on their reading. And if criteria for masculinity or wise remarks about frigidity generate from the locker room, we know we have some pretty inaccurate and dangerous stuff. Let's be accurate—or let's skip the whole thing.

We must all understand, nevertheless, that the insistence on accuracy may be a part of our problem. So much of the scientific aspects of our sex life is mixed up with Christian and Judaic beliefs and the cultural patterns of tribal origin that one who tries to bring science into the story may become a fit target for those whose beliefs have been outraged. Furthermore, the scientists themselves, whether physiologists, psychologists, endocrinologists, or any other kind of organic scientist, probably know how far away they are from "accuracy" in describing sexual function. Just try to do a scientific and accurate job on homosexuality in the classroom! In the first place, not enough is known about it scientifically to do a convincing job on it, and in the second place, philosophers, religionists, scientists, and writers for 2,500 years have been quarreling as to whether homosexuality is normal. In fact, the plot gets thicker when you realize that there is no definitive agreement as to whether humans are naturally heterosexual, bisexual, or homosexual! In our culture, we make it clear that only heterosexuality is acceptable, but is this cultural or physiological? Nobody knows—for sure.

7. *We do not need continued fragmentation of the curriculum into little sub-areas relating to health.* Sex education and family living is one of these. It sticks out like a sore thumb when introduced into the curriculum as something separate and apart from the rest. It becomes a convenient target for those who do not understand what we are trying to do in the total field of school health instruction. We do not need a separate treatment for sex education at the elementary or secondary levels any more than we need a semester of environmental health, or physiology of the human body, or dental health, or mental health, or drug abuse. Such segmentation is a remnant of a past approach. To offer these subjects as separate credit units actually interferes with the development of a full-bodied curriculum in health education as represented by our modern courses of study. Once we can develop these complete and graded curriculums, all of these neat sub-areas will meld into an intelligent approach to the study of human beings as a whole.

Some day we will see the light. Dawn will break and bathe our curriculum makers in health education or physical education and other life sciences with the truth of a person's unity and integrated nature. And we will develop our courses of study not around these structural segments of a person's life but around the person's various constellations of problems. We will all stop talking about body and mind as if they were separate things. We will end this stupidity about physical health and mental health. Physical educators will see the educational as well as the developmental aspects of their field. The body beautiful may still be beautiful but only as a byproduct and not as the end of their efforts. Health educators will stop this prattle about health as an end and see their efforts as leading to development and improvement of self as an expendable tool toward the achievement of one's purposes.

Finally, we need community involvement. Despite the unpleasant experiences of some 50 or more communities that have come under the fire of the organized opposition to sex education, I believe San Diego and Anaheim and Bexley and hundreds of other places have been right. We do need community involvement in this area, and we do not need unilateral development. Communities could well start where Illinois started, with formation of a statewide sex education advisory board, advisory to the office of the state superintendent of public instruction. They have approached this area constructively and produced "A Policy Statement and Suggested Steps Toward Implementing Family Life and Sex Education Programs" and other literature helpful to the public and to school people alike. Communities might do what San Diego did years ago, as reported in the *Journal of School Health* in 1959 and 1961 by G. G. Wetherill.[13] There a year or more was spent in advance of the introduction of units on sex education in the health education program to cultivate the interest of parents and secure not only their approval but, more important, their understanding.

To tell the story of intent to adult groups capable of serious thought in school matters does two things: it aids the adults in the broadening of their understanding about the needs of their children, and it frequently gives the school people a broader understanding of the needs of children and how to meet them. (We found that out years ago in the Ohio study when hundreds of parents were involved in pointing out to us the crucial areas of need in health education.) Those who go it alone in the development of programs are asking, if not for trouble, at least for misunderstanding.

But who could have predicted this rash, this epidemic of volatile criticism? Did the Birch Society or Drake or Hargis or Marrow run out of things to attack now that we have the "new leadership in the White House"? How can we explain the vitriol, the damaging personal attacks on Mary Calderone and others of the SIECUS organization? How does one get at the dynamics of the efforts of these local crusaders who are so convinced of the holy rightness of their position? I asked these questions of some friends, and among the many helpful answers I received was this one from Dr. Marion Pollock: "Sex is always news. It's ironic to see the current absorption of the public with explicitly depicted nudity, perversity, sex acts of one kind or another in films and on the stage, in the literature, on television, advertising, at the same time the public is reeling back in horror at the news that sex education is being taught in the schools. Sadly, I believe it is because adults do not know what sex education is, so they interpret it in terms of their own experience. We live in a society in which, willingly or not, we are voyeurs. Yet in the midst of it, there is this clamor by certain groups to protect children from the 'filth' which they preceive education about sex to be! 'Would you want your 8-year-old daughter to hear such filth as "reproduction" and "uterus"?' asked one indignant mother! Are we moving too fast, too far, or are we okay? I guess it depends on who 'we' are, and who is looking at 'us'."

I found a 10-year-old publication on "Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs" helpful.[14] This one warned me not to assume that all our violent opponents of the day are crackpots or malevolent or ignorant. Some of their followers may be misled, but they are not all stupid. These people must be met on their own terms and brought around not by tactics similar to theirs but by explanation, demonstration, and discussion. It seems so easy for those misdirected people to pick on the schools—just when schools need breathing space to solidify gains in instructional theory and practice and adjust to the population explosion.

But again, it has always been that way. Instead of taking on other social or commercial institutions that may have something to do with the development of children, these strange people find teachers easy to pick on and, for the most part, too professional or too frightened or too something to fight back. These scoundrels are afraid our efforts in sex education are demoralizing our youth. Are we responsible for the high crime rate in our cities? For the higher divorce rate, too? For racial tensions? For automobile accidents? For drug abuse? Where do the examples of cruelty, avarice, violence, dishonesty, prejudice, and inhumanity come from? Do these destructive leaders of this destructive anti-sex education movement ever wonder? They seem afraid to tackle what might be a militant adversary from the world of private enterprise, or they would direct the fire of their anger on others. Who are the more influential teachers—Vanessa Redgrave and Mia Farrow, or Miss Snodgrass in the 7th grade? Don't be ridiculous, Dr. Drake and Mr. Hargis! Why not earn your living elsewhere where you can pan some real gold?

The tempest, violent though it is, will blow over, leaving scars and some dead bodies, leaving some silly laws on the books that will have to be repealed or circumvented (remember the laws about evolution?). The kids will suffer—being denied access to good materials—but they will survive to pass along the misconceptions and irrelevancies they have picked up in place of the good stuff they might have learned in school.

In conclusion, let me try to alleviate the fears of some about sex education in schools. There is no war on, no diabolical plot to undermine the teachings of Christianity or Judaism or Mohammedanism or anything else. True, there may be capricious sensationalists among our teachers who, turned loose in this area, may make asses of themselves and titillate and disturb their charges. But these are so few in number compared to the rest of us who seek only to substitute enlightenment for bewilderment and ignorance and to provide substance to be used in the decision-making process so prominent in our lives from 8 to 80. To be sure, there are a few teachers who, by virtue of their perverse personalities, know nothing of love or reverence or morality and thus barge into this area to create chaos and criticism. Furthermore, it will be necessary to remember how slowly the public receives any new and threatening ideas—ideas that threaten established and traditional concepts, particularly those that have a close relationship to church or state. Galileo felt the scorn of the Church and suffered the tortures of the Inquisition. Closer to our interests, perhaps, are the struggles of Harvey, Jenner, Semmelweiss, and Pasteur as they attempted to introduce new ideas or change our ways of thinking concerning biological states. The idea of the smallpox vaccination as first set forth by Jenner took almost a hundred years to take hold in this country, and Semmelweiss' concern about contamination took almost as long.

So here we are again. Frankness, truth, revelation in the areas of sex education meet with a public uproar from those who fear the destruction of their comfortable ways of living. So they conjure up the specter of Communism or any other wolf in sheep's clothing to persecute, embarrass, or degrade those who would enlighten. We must remember that so much of man remains in the realm of the unknown. We know so little about him. That is why we have these resurgencies of mysticism—of critical attitudes—as seeming reactions against modern science. But it would be a great error for all of us if we assumed that the phenomenon of sex about which we purport to educate can be reduced to an exact science and the ethics surrounding its use computerized. If ethics and morals could be programed in human beings we would be in a lot less trouble than we are, but so far we have been able only to destroy man—not to create him. Man's problem thus, as I interpret Langdon Gilkey, is not just to enlighten his mind or develop a will to control his instinctive machine, but to be seen as a totality, a unified being made of body and of instincts, of conscious and subconscious, of intelligence and will, all in baffling and complex interaction.[15] And it is that total psychophysical organism, that total existing self in its unity, that determines whether the higher powers of mind and of will are going to be used creatively or destructively. Thus, a person's health or unhealth depends primarily on the fundamental character, direction, and loyalty of oneself as a whole, involving the deepest level of his being where his spiritual unity is achieved.

NOTES

1. Lillian Hellman, "An Unfinished Woman: A Memoir," *Saturday Review*, July 5, 1969, p. 30.
2. "Health Education: A Conceptual Approach to Curriculum Design," *The School Health Education Study*, Elena M. Sliepcevich, director (St. Paul, MN: 3M Educational Press, 1969).
3. "Growth Patterns and Sex Education, *The Journal of School Health* 37, no. 5a, May 1967.
4. Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, Publication Office, 1825 Willow Road, Northfield, IL 60093.

5. Helen Manley, *A Curriculum Guide in Sex Education* (St. Louis: State Publishing Co., 1964).
6. Esther D. Schulz and Sally R. Williams, *Family Life and Sex Education Curriculum and Instruction* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969).
7. Henry A. Bowman, *Marriage for Moderns*, 5th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).
8. James Leslie McCary, *Human Sexuality* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1967).
9. Robert Capon, *Dead and Board* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1965).
10. Derrick Sherwin Bailey, *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought* (New York: Harper Bros., 1959).
11. H. S. Hoyman, "Where Are We Now in Sex Education—An Appraisal," Mimeographed, University of Illinois-Urbana, 1969.
12. Elena M. Sliepcevich, "Should Health Be Interested in School and College Health Programs?" *Journal of School Health* 33, no. 4, April 1963, p. 145.
13. G. G. Wetherill, "Who Is Responsible for Sex Education," *Journal of School Health* 29, no. 10, Dec. 1959, p. 361; and "Sex Education in the Public Schools," *Journal of School Health* 31, no. 7, Sept. 1961, p. 235.
14. Judd Marmor, Viola W. Bernard and Perry Ottenberg, "Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 30, no. 2, April 1960.
15. Langdon Gilkey, *Shantung Compound* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 115.

An Appraisal of Health Education in the Space Age

To appraise health education in the space age gives one the opportunity to look at many facets of the field. I have chosen to examine three of them to discover, if we can, meaning, implication, or direction. Let us look, first, at the advancement of science and what it means to health education; second, at the relation of health education to liberal and general education; and third, at curriculum problems involved in the development of health instruction in schools.

The recent Parliament of Science held in March 1958 in Washington, D.C., under the auspices of the American Association for the Advancement of Science concluded that the power of man through science is currently assuming a new order of magnitude. How to use this knowledge and this power and what it means for the benefit of mankind confronts us now as the most challenging question of the day.

We are just beginning to see that these advances, tremendous as they are, constitute the signal, rather than the nucleus of the atom. Science is entering a new and accelerated stage of advancement, which will give to humanity the possibility of control over our environment, over ourselves, and over our destiny. With prospects that are both marvelous and frightening, we are on the threshold of a revolutionary probing of the cell and of the mind.[1]

Delivered at the joint meeting of the American School Health Association and the School Health and Public Health Education Sections of the American Public Health Association, at the annual meetings in St. Louis, October 28, 1958.

There is reason to believe, reports the Parliament, that the changes we are now seeing, along with those to come, will make the Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries seem relatively insignificant in its bearing upon human welfare. A few examples may suffice. Researchers in biophysics, like those in biochemistry, may come up with important new facts regarding such diverse matters as metabolism, the pairing of genes, or the effect of atomic radiation upon longevity. By-products of fissionable materials are being used in the control of cancer. A new polio vaccine may not merely control polio but wipe the virus from the face of the earth. Remarkable advances in the science of anesthesia enable surgeons to attempt and succeed with operations undreamed of 20 years ago. The effects upon people of altitude, speed, and sound are being thoroughly studied. In recent years we have profited from the development of the sulfa drugs, antibiotics, the sterol derivatives, and drugs for mental diseases. The psychologist is teaming with the psychiatrist to get at the causes of irrational behavior and thus possibly to make great strides in reducing mental disturbance.

The impact of automation and its implications for leisure will not be denied as a health problem. New knowledge about heart disease, nutrition, dental caries, old age, and virtually every other aspect of human existence is yielding perhaps a secret a day to the probing, insatiable investigator.

Perhaps among the most fascinating and important of the problems that will yield to study and research will be those in the area of mental health and social behavior. Surely the massive nature of these problems as they exist today offer a splendid target for both the teacher and the researcher. Not only are millions of persons beset with problems of anxiety, fear, boredom, and lack of orientation, but we have not yet found ways to create a healthy social climate. Perhaps we will see the social anthropologist, the biologist, the psychiatrist, and surely others combine their talents to reveal the causes and nature of interracial and international unrest. We may soon learn something of the pathology of prejudice and treat as ill those who find themselves constitutionally or prejudicially unable to accept the human race as it is. The cooperative efforts of our scientists of the future will, I venture to say, reveal a great deal about the kind of mentality that permits crushing humiliation to be vested by one person upon another. World problems of population control, pandemics, food distribution, sanitation, and the abolition of feelings of racial superiority and social bigotry herald, with their very pressing presence, the space age.

The health educator must be aware of these problems so that he or she can lead others to recognize them and, beyond that, to understand the causes of the behavior that create the problem. Somehow the world must be taught to face a set of realities involving the affairs and destiny of humanity.

But supposing we health educators knew all about these problems. What would we do with it all? As the farmer said when encouraged to seek some advanced training, "Shucks, I ain't using but half what I know now." It seems clear that the general public is about in that situation. The public is putting to use much less of the available scientific information than it should.

If we are to make full and good use of this information, we educators must improve our techniques not only of familiarizing ourselves with the substance of this advance, particularly in the life sciences, but perhaps even more important, we must vastly improve our skills of communication with the student and general public in an effort to achieve greater acceptance on their part of the material we are making available to them.

But first the health educator, both school and public, must possess the information. It comes at us from every side. Pick up *The Journal of School Health, The American Journal of Public Health, Science*—any half dozen other good publications in the life sciences—and one can read indefinitely about these modern developments. Furthermore, there must be more than a thousand books a year published in this country alone on subjects related to human health. Information is available everywhere, and if ever a group of people need to work together to share this information, we in health education do. This is no time for jurisdictional disputes or coy snobbishness about who is better prepared to do the job. Everyone had better be well prepared, and everyone had better help everyone else meet the demands of the situation. From the classroom teacher in the second grade in a small village to the well equipped science teacher in our best metropolitan high schools, from the itinerant consultant in a state department of health to the scriptwriters in public relations departments, from the physical education teacher who teaches the "health course" one hour a week to the imposing college professor with his closed-circuit television—all of these need resources, help, assistance, from any and all quarters where decent aid may be obtained. This means the voluntary agencies must get into the classroom with their educational material. It means the state departments of health and state departments of education must give thought to action through planning committees or other devices. It means the beautiful materials such as published by the National Health Education Committee should reach at least every college teacher of health education in the land and thousands of others also. It means our associations (like these meeting here today) must redouble their efforts to bring substantial stuff to the working personnel in health education who are in need. It means that if the government will spend $2 million, or whatever, for the improvement of the teaching of physics, it should spend $5 million on a similar project in health education.

The Status of Health Education. Right now we are going through a period of sober re-examination of the purposes and content of the curriculum from the first grade through college. The professional educator has received an avalanche of advice from commissions, foundations, statesmen, admirals, and scientists as well as generous advice from the man in the street who writes an occasional letter to the editor. Some good will come of it. In the meantime, where does health education stand in and through all this? How do we appraise our position? Will the health education of the general student be thought of as vocationally oriented only and thus denied to the brilliant student who achieves a liberal or general education? Or will a knowledge and understanding of human life and how it is lived be considered valuable to the liberal culture of an educated person?

At the moment, and at the college level at least, we seem to prize liberal education over specialized or vocational education. We seem to believe our leadership of the future will come from those men and women who have been carefully nurtured in the liberal tradition. For the others we will seek and get a general education composed of a minimal cultural background in science, language, the arts, and the social studies.

Let us examine the purposes of liberal patterns of education. One source holds that a liberal education seeks to develop a cultivated elite in our population. Another wants to prepare students to "play a fruitful role in our social and political life," another to teach the college student "how to think," or "to acquaint him with the great ideas of civilization." To help the student become a person of breadth and discrimination and to give the person inner resources of strength and stability so to guide effectively his or her own life is a laudable aim. Describe it any way you wish—make a "liberal" education central or incidental to your plans for the reconstruction of education—and I believe you will find that health education, being germane to life itself and its living, will be and is as foundational as language and as necessary to survival of the race, I daresay, as physics or chemistry. Can you imagine anyone "playing a fruitful role in our society" who is beset with the aberrations of a sick mind—made sick because of an inability to solve his or her own problems? Can you imagine the loss of valuable manpower from preventable disease? Can anyone be called a skillful thinker who knows so little of human nature as to squander his or her strength and talent in irrational living? How can one expect our statesmen or our politicians or anyone else for that matter to solve other people's problems or to guide their own lives without knowing something about the life they have to guide?

Health education can be thought of as nothing else than *central* to liberal or general education. Properly put together, health education represents a synthesis of the best of the sciences and the arts as this best bears upon human health, survival, and welfare. Properly developed, it takes pertinent material from the biologies, from medicine and kindred fields, from psychology, and from the social studies and makes from these contributions a study aimed at improving the quality of human life.

But health education is not yet what the traditional scholar thinking in traditional ways recognizes as a "discipline." It does not stand among scholarly fields as something uniquely contributory to this world's knowledge. It has no unique areas of investigation, no unique methodology, not even a characteristic philosophy to guide its application. This is not to say it cannot or will not have these qualities. It is merely to say that as of now, the beginning of the space age, health education does not have the traditional earmarks of an academic discipline. Whether advancing knowledge in the science of personality, further study of the relation of the psyche to the soma, and kindred frontier investigations will aid the recognition of health education as a field of knowledge remains to be seen. Perhaps additional knowledge on the nature of creativity in relation to fulfillment of man's purposes will help the cause.

But until then health education probably will not be considered an "academic" subject. It is, as I have said, a synthesis of many fields brought together for utilitarian, pragmatic purposes. As such it will probably remain handicapped in the competitive race for a place in the curriculum. Worse yet, we have seen in the post-Sputnik panic many of the "special" subjects like health education, home economics, and industrial arts ridiculed as being unimportant. Life-adjustment courses, meaning principally health education, were particularly held up to scorn.

It will all shake down, and I venture to predict that when it does health education will have a central place in the education of young people, whether they are pursuing a liberal education or a vocational one. It will, provided we in health education improve our ways of presenting the material.

J. S. Haldane once said: "All true knowledge must be a gradual revelation of the lower or more abstract in terms of the higher or more concrete aspects of reality; and as the conception of organism is a higher and more concrete conception of matter and energy science must ultimately aim at gradually interpreting the physical world of matter and energy in terms of the biological conception of organism."[2] Does this mean that health education, being one form of biological interpretation of organism, can do nothing else in the long run than grow in stature and importance? I believe so. It may, to be sure, lose its identity as such; but it will, if science grows and if Haldane is right, eventually become the framework in which we shall understand the physical world of matter and energy.

Problems of Curriculum. How can the curriculum in health education be improved to meet the needs of the space age? I would like to suggest three ways:

First, we could vastly improve the effectiveness of the relation between the health educator and the students. There is far too much wordage in teaching. Too many words, far too little action. Why are so many people under 40 unvaccinated against polio when they know better? They have been told the facts of life! Why are so many people eating themselves into poor health? They know better too. Why do people not act more promptly in the face of illness that is preventable through an early diagnosis?

In our teacher preparation curriculums, wherever health educators are prepared, we have to step up considerably our study of motivation. We shall have to learn a great deal more about the learning process than we know now. We shall have to find ways of moving more surely from knowledge to action in the field of healthful living. Nell McKeever and Mayhew Derryberry mapped out five areas we should know much more about in this connection, in order to make our health education more useful.[3] They effectually sum up the needs in this realm:

1. The individual's behavior, beliefs, motivations, goals, and ways of carrying these out.
2. The individual's attitudes and past experiences that facilitate progress or create barriers to change.
3. The group's goals, traditions, beliefs, practices, values, and cultures.
4. The leadership-followership patterns established by the people.
5. The objective advisability of change and the individual's or group's acceptance of change.

Second, we need to re-examine all existing courses and curriculums now offered to the general student for purposes of placing the material in more appropriate grade levels. Such a re-examination will also turn up considerable material that can be removed from health courses entirely. I have the feeling, as I look at dozens of courses of study and textbooks each year, that we are gearing our material too low for the student. We are boring students. We are not challenging them. We teach them things about nutrition in the seventh grade they could well handle in the fifth and once handled they do not want to hear about it again, particularly in their college health course. We dodge important matters like the study of medical care or of sex education because they are so "controversial" and leave in such pap as how to care for the fingernails or how to blow the nose. We need to let some things alone, dig out the really important substance of health education, and teach it where it will challenge these young people to some real thinking and studying. Is there a high school or college course taught anywhere that contains a well developed unit on racial similarities and differences as a foundation for a discussion of the pathology of prejudice? Are college health classes investigating radiation fallout as a phase for thoughtful consideration of our position vis-a-vis the continuance of atomic testing?

Would a college class or an upper division high school group find profit in analyzing the implications of the geophysical year for improvement in human health? Would the reading of Norman Cousins' editorial "Our Casual Approach to Violence," in the August 31, 1957, *Saturday Review*—written, to be sure, with reference to the international situation—serve as a stimulus to a discussion of our personal relations to each other? If it is true that the biggest problems of the future will involve teaching people to live together and eradicate the heritage of hatred from past aggression, then no one- or two-hour periods on mental health will do the job!

Perhaps the college will give back to the secondary school much of the material now taught about eating habits, prevention of disease, and "how to choose a dentist" and concentrate its precious time on a more adult type of productive and exciting experience suitable to the alert college student of today. Perhaps those problems will center mostly on the areas of mental health, social and family life, new implications of science for health, problems of population, and how to be balanced though brilliant!

The curriculum all the way up and down needs enriching. It would profit from joint planning and a form of joint participation where the contributing scientists pool their resources and come up with a solid time-consuming course (none of these one-hour-a-week horrors will do in the space age). We should expect our health courses to represent a synthesis of the best from all contributing fields as it applies to the health of humans.

But am I suggesting only an extension of the tradition of horizontal development of any curriculum, so that health education becomes still another subject to be "taken" in the course of one's educational experience? Not exclusively so. As long as a curriculum at any level remains segmented into subjects based on distinctions among bodies of knowledge, then I suppose we would do well to continue our efforts in the space age to cultivate health education as the study of the science of living healthfully into a discipline by itself with all the accoutrements of time, credit, and professional personnel. The separate "course" in health education can well stand for greater and more productive refinement as a learning experience on its own feet and command respect as something worthwhile. This will be an honorable effort as long as we deal with education in such horizontal segmentation.

But the space age, whatever its other characteristics may be, will be an age marked by integration. This concept, no matter what abuse it may be taking now from those who ridicule educational "jargon," remains the most promising pattern for the education of the future because it represents the essence of all that humanity is. One could hardly be expected to learn much about an integrated organism unless one knew something of the nature of integration and approached the study of humans and their processes of living by learning of their integrative experiences.

It may be, therefore, that health education in the space age may center more and more around our larger problems of economic, social, and organic survival. We may study the details of our "physical" life in relation quite properly to our wants, goals, and ambitions. We may seek to understand our diseases and degenerations in terms not merely of invasions of our tissues but also by knowing something of our frustrations.

The fact of a person's integrative nature and integrating development, the fact of a person's natural struggle against disintegration have already given the educator grounds for the acceptance in principle of integrated curriculums. We have not as yet found the easily applied practical answer in terms of curriculum reform, but we'll get it. The fact of human nature will force us to get that answer.

Right now we can only surmise that the integrating influence will be felt in health education in any of these three ways: (a) we shall present either integrated or integrative studies of health problems affecting human life within the compartmentalized health education course itself; (b) we shall seek to enrich currently used integrating experiences now developed in core curriculums; and (c) we shall aid teachers in traditionally subject-centered curriculums to explore with their students the meaning of their subject matter in terms of life as it can be lived productively and healthfully as a result of the study of their subject. We may even go so far in this third pattern as to encourage the complete fusion of health education with science, as for example, into a "health-science" course.

No one should allow the current to-do urging the return to the "tough" compartmentalized courses loaded with memory work, lectures, quizzes, and the regurgitation of knowledge to be taken too seriously. People in education are generally smarter than to believe that those "good old-fashioned methods" and curriculum arrangements are the best way to educate youth. We shall get further with our objectives if we keep moving forward with our curriculum developments.

And thus we present an appraisal. Health education will, I hope, have a significant role to play in the space age. It will if it succeeds in distilling from all the sciences their substance that is most potent for human life. If Glenn Seaborg will allow me to paraphrase him, I would say we must recognize that a basic knowledge of health is fundamental to good citizenship and effective participation in today's society. We hold to the view that a liberal education is the best preparation for a life of significant achievement and service and that no education can be considered liberal that does not include health education as an integral part."[4]

Somehow health education properly and enthusiastically conceived and taught cannot help but aid man, in the words of Fillmore Sanford, "to rise to his own best level of energy and vigor, of spontaneity, of creativity, of enjoyment." [5] This could well be the goal of health education in the space age.

NOTES

1. "1958 Parliament of Science," *Science* 127, no. 3303, April 18, 1958, p. 852.
2. J. S. Haldane, *Mechanism, Life and Personality* (New York: Dutton, 1914), p. 98.
3. Nell McKeever and Mayhew Derryberry, "What Does the Changing Picture in Public Health Mean to Health Education in Programs and Practices?," *The American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health* 46, no. 1, Jan. 1956, p. 54.
4. Glenn T. Seaborg, "Education in Our Age: Let's Define the Problem," *California Schools* 29, no. 6, June 1958, p. 340.
5. Fillmore H. Sanford, "Creative Health and the Principle of Habeas Mentem," *American Journal of Public Health* 46, no. 2, Feb. 1956, p. 139.

Health Instruction

We are here using the term health *instruction,* rather than the term health *education,* in order to indicate that we are talking about the organized instructional work that goes on in the classroom or laboratory. We distinguish health instruction from health education, because we believe that any activity conducted in the school—from the processes of sanitary engineering and immunology to instruction in the classroom—provides health education to the children. The visit to the physician or the dentist, the ventilation of the school room, the visual problems, matters of disease prevention, experiences in the cafeteria, all add up to and contribute to the health education of the participants. By health instruction, we are referring to the lessons or laboratory experiences learned in the classroom under the guidance of a prepared and, we hope, experienced teacher.

There are those, of course, who wonder just why health instruction needs to be offered as a special course by itself. Students actually do learn a great deal about health from courses in the various sciences, home economics, physical education, even history and literature. There is probably no course offered in the curriculum that does not contribute something to learning about health. It is difficult to teach anything without health implications. This, of course, is because health itself, being a study of living, ramifies through virtually every aspect of an elementary or secondary school curriculum.

To offer a specific and direct approach to a study of health, however, produces results far in excess of those dependent upon the process of correlation with other subjects. There are very good reasons why any school, from elementary through secondary school and into college, should offer opportunities for direct instruction in health, as follows:

1. Because 75 percent of our students terminate their education at the end of their secondary school experience and thus bring to an end any contact they might have with the scientific world relating to personal or public health—except as they may pick it up from their readings and study as adults in continuing education programs.

2. Because there is far too much going on in disease prevention and treatment, in child protection, in surgery, and in other forms of interesting scientific development to let the students rely on lesser sources.

3. Because the American public has a voice in public affairs, and health is a public affair. Thus, some study of its personal and public implications are necessary to and desirable for a literate and understanding population.

4. Because the American public spends billions on quacks, false leads, false hopes, and disappointments, and early education will protect them against much of that.

5. Because there are some half million or more new cases of psychological disturbance in our population every year. It is estimated, for example, that one out of every 20 thirteen-year-old school children need some kind of psychological or emotional guidance, without which they may develop more serious psychoses and become personal problems to the family or the community.

6. Because there are still too many broken homes and unhappy marriages, many of which might be prevented with more appropriate kinds of health instruction.

7. Because there is still far too much unnecessary maternal mortality each year, and some half a million babies still die in the first year of their lives—many of them needlessly because mothers are uninformed about early childhood care.

8. Because there are still far too many babies born with congenital syphilis, too many deaths from whooping cough, far too many instances of rheumatic heart disease, and far too many tuberculous school children—much of which could be prevented with a better kind of health instruction given to the prospective parent.

9. Because there is important information in the fields of nutrition, family life, recreation, santitation, and various other frontiers of health instruction, which need to be brought to the attention of students of any age.

It is not too difficult to develop a set of clear-cut objectives of school health instruction, which we suggest as follows:

1. To secure behavior (action, conduct, habits) favorable to a high quality of living, and to point the way to those acts that, if performed, will assure this high quality.

2. To assist in the development of a well integrated personality, enjoying life with no reliance upon false superiorities or inferiorities but with a stability rooted in a capacity for accurate self-appraisal.

3. To clarify thinking about personal and public health matters; to remove the superstitions, the false beliefs, the ignorance; and to substitute the accuracy of science, where available, for the darkness of falsehood and misbelief.

4. To facilitate the development of security against the threats and destructive forces of the world through the acquisition of scientific knowledge, the formation of scientific attitudes, and the practice of scientific behavior.

5. To enrich the life of the community and commonwealth through the collective action of individuals well taught in the advantages of health measures to be taken for the common good.

6. To establish the ability in students to see cause and effect, to recognize consequences, and thus to preserve life and the fullness of it.

To affect favorably the personal life of an individual is the ultimate goal not only of health teaching but of all public health work. Surely all health teaching must be focused directly on the impact it makes *upon a given person*. The favorable changes that may be made in a person's life are the changes that count. Whenever one sees a table showing, for example, that 1,000 mothers die for every 100,000 births one must recognize that each of these thousand was an individual. Nothing could be effective in saving their lives except as it touched each one of them. If instruction could have done it in some cases, then it had to be instruction that was acceptable and used by that woman. Sanitary engineers have improved the public health by cleaning up the water supply and thus protecting individuals against typhoid fever. No health lecturer ever spoke for an hour to 500 people and did any good whatever except insofar as the people themselves individually lived by the advice given. "The public health" is but the sum of the individual "healths" of the people who make up the "public."

Thus, *all health teaching must be directed at persons.* No impersonal general approach will be as effective.

Such teaching, therefore, must be based upon, must be related to, must in fact be identical with the needs and interests of consuming learners. People of all ages have needs and interests. Sometimes they are articulate about them, sometimes not. Sometimes students readily reveal their interests. Sometimes they hide them. The teacher of health instruction must have the ability to dig them out wherever they are, to organize them for class purposes, and to use them as the material with which the class deals. (We shall discuss later how these interests may be discovered.) We can hope for a greater acceptance of health information if it relates to the problems of students than if it is arbitrarily selected and unrelated to these real problems.

On what grounds can we justify the satisfaction of personal needs in health teaching? Three general statements may be made to support this view:

1. People will not think vitally about a subject unless the subject is vital to them. The material selected to go into a course in health ought to be material that is an intrinsic part of the life of the learners. W. H. Kilpatrick once said that learners must see and feel the utility and pertinence of what is being learned as a matter of present concern to them. Only thus will they intelligently join in the movement or apply the knowledge to an actual situation. The closer the conscious relationship, the better the learning.

In view of these statements, then, the best way to get students to think vitally about their health problems would be to seek out those problems of living that are vital to them. Their interests and felt needs play just such a role.

2. Learning, for the most part, is highly specific. Students do not, as a general rule, first learn generalities and then make their applications. Learning about a particular thing takes place by specific experiences with each particular subject.

There are very good reasons to question the desirability of teaching generalizations or abstractions first. To know that digestion is principally an acid reaction or that there is phosphorus in bone may be interesting factual material to the physiologist or the anatomist, but to the ordinary consumer—the student who merely wants help in solving his or her problems of living—these are not relevant facts until they can be shown in relation to the known problem. They remain unrelated generalizations until their bearing upon some specific matter calls them up.

The idea that a person has of an abstract matter is dependent upon the sort of situations in which that matter has been previously experienced. Symonds makes this apparent when he says, "A misconception that is found throughout all education is that learning proceeds from the general to the particular. . . . Conduct begins by the formation of separate skills and habits. . . . It is a curious anomaly that we take the end result in our own learning and try to make it the beginning in the learning of children." In other words, the generalizations we make about health, such as "the mouth is an avenue of entrance of disease," or "exercise is beneficial to health," are conclusions not readily apparent at first except by persons with trained minds or by those with an exceptionally high degree of intelligence. The generalizations or logical arrangements of experiences are continuous with, but represent the later stages of, the learning process and should not be used as points of departure.

Students have traditionally been taught to understand the best health practices only after they have studied the anatomy and physiology involved. Thus, to understand the importance of the balanced diet, they have had first to know of enzymes, amino acids, calorimeters, and nitrogen equilibrium. In order to understand how to develop a wholesome adjustment to life, they have approached the problem through the Fissures of Rolando, the centers in the medulla, or the cortical areas.

The wealth of material in human anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, and the other great sciences that have revealed the workings of human life is teachable in explanation of a human problem. The material is largely wasted when given as new material and merely to teach the student the structure and function of the body. *It may even be said that there is no use at all in teaching the structure and function of the body unless the learner can use the material to further his or her development and solve his or her problems.* It is the problems and the development that offer the point of approach for the science. Otherwise the science may become wasted because, being unrelated to anything going on in the life of the learner, it is dry and dull.

3. Interests manifested by questions or outspoken curiosity represent the individual's attempts to maintain a favorable relationship with his or her environment. We may call these articulate interests. They are revealed to the teacher by the spoken word in the form of questions arising out of some situation in which learning is taking place and in which the need for a new adjustment to environment has appeared.

Raup has described this as a constant effort on the part of the human being to maintain a state of favorable adjustment with his or her world. Raup's contentions are based upon the universality of the characteristic of living things continually to be seeking a balance, or a "complacency," between themselves and their environment.

Thus, daily problems of living present the most favorable media for effective learning about health. It is within those experiences that one seeks the answers rather than have the answers to problems thrust upon oneself. A learning experience has the elements within it of the ongoing activitity, the hindrance, the search for promising ways to overcome the hindrance, the application or trial of the ways, and the resumption of the activity or the solution of the problem.

Our problems are so numerous that they are not, of course, all of the same simplicity. Some are very complex, and to solve them requires learning in many areas of living. One learns of marriage, for example, not by studying some of the rudimentary phenomena of sex life but by delving far into the factors that make for successful marriage. The economic, the psychological, and the social factors are all important. When they are taught, they are better learned if their relation to the personal problems of marriage is apparent. Thus material is intrinsic when it deals with or helps solve a problem and its relation to the problem is seen. It is extrinsic when it is learned merely for its own sake and without reference to any ongoing activity or problem in the life of the learner. The material intrinsic to the solution of a problem has the better chance of being learned effectively.

But where and how can a teacher discover the interests and needs of students?

So far some 12 sources of student needs and interests have been tapped by those who seek to discover them, as follows:

1. Student questions. Given a fair and honest chance to ask questions, students will ask them in abundance. The questions, for the most part, are reliable indications of need. They are, in fact, needs themselves.

2. Parental testimony. Parents can, if they will, throw considerable light on important problems suitable for class discussion.

3. The opinions of experts. Similiar in value to parental testimony would be the opinions and observations of experts in child life or health education. Teachers, counselors, physicians, nurses, and others close to children or to families are excellent sources of student health problems.

4. Morbidity statistics. What is the nature of the illnesses of the age group being taught? From what diseases do they suffer? What are the principal causes of their illness? Such information locally for the age groups being taught would make the morbidities a fit subject for classroom discussion.

5. Mortality. Similarly, a study of the death rates for any age will reveal opportunities for education concerning the causes.

6. Analyses of school life. School life itself produces health problems. There is no reason to believe that "going to school" is altogether a healthy experience. Many a child, as a direct result of having to go to school, now has impaired vision or is nervous and emotionally unbalanced or has tuberculosis or caught a communicable disease and now has impaired hearing. Schooling frequently leaves its mark. To find these sources of problems, and to discuss the adjustments necessary to meet them, is a splendid subject for health instruction.

7. Analyses of home life. What problems are created by the home? What sort of health conditions are found there? This is a rich source for student problems.

8. Analyses of community life. If there are great sources of infection in the community environment, if there are no playgrounds useful in combatting idleness, if the water or food supply is unsafe because of lack of sanitary measures, or if sources of pollution abound, these make fit subjects for discussion in health instruction.

9. Analyses of literature. What do students read?

10. Analyses of modern communications. What programs on radio and television affect the health of children? What are the influences of commercials?

11. Analyses of the findings from physical examinations.

12. Analyses of school health records.

These are sources of needs and interests, and with probing on the part of the teacher and the students they can be brought out for classroom discussion. As measures of the daily problems of living, they are favorable media for effective learning about health.

The Mental Health of Children

To many of us there is no more fascinating study than that of the adjustment of youth to the favorable and adverse circumstances of their world. Once it is possible to throw aside preconceived notions, obstructing superstitions, and 19th-century concepts of "childrearing," one can strike gold in the promising fields of problem-discovery and action-planning in regard to the mental health of children. As of now, child behavior is relatively unpredictable. We know little about it. And yet our generation of investigators has made great progress in revealing to those of us who teach or otherwise work with children some of the conditions under which our work can best go on.

It was J. K. Hall, twenty years ago, who said:

> Most of the difficulty in modern life is not caused by our struggle with matter, but with our own beliefs and our own thoughts, and with the thoughts of others. The field of man's battle is within his own mind—with his own instincts, his own thoughts, his own feelings. His life is made constantly more difficult, not only by the multitudinous devices with which he has to work but even more so by the network of laws and customs with which he has entangled himself. Most of the tragedies of life are due to conflicts between primitive ways and the demands of civilization.

Delivered at the annual meeting of the Association for Childhood Education International, Seattle, Washington, March 27, 1951.

If there are those who are alarmed about the mental health of our population, if we are unhappy about such contemporary matters as morals, manners, and values, it would be well to examine the character of the environment we have built for an adolescent of today. Let us say he is 17 years old. He was born in 1934. He went to school at about the time Hitler was beginning his destruction of the Western world. Six million Jews were in the process of being murdered. A quarter of a million Americans were soon to give their lives to a cause that they little understood. The papers of his elementary years were filled with news of the fascist aggression abroad and of social upheaval at home.

In childhood he saw six years of the most terrifying war the world has known. These children have never known peace. In early adolescence, lately that is, he has seen danger, threats, hydrogen bombs, the draft, strikes, walkouts, talk of bacterial warfare, anxiety over high prices, a rising suicide rate, quick marriages, insecure teachers, and immorality in his sports. What a world! These young people have lived in times characterized in almost every respect by moral retrogression.

The effort the 17-year-old must expend to develop those sturdy qualities of personality that mark him as "emotionally mature," "psychologically stable," or more simply, "well adjusted" is prodigious. We, the adults of his world, are slowly driving him to distraction. It is more of a wonder that our children survive psychologically than it is that a few million of them crack up!

What are the facts? There are so many of them one has to choose among them. Among third-grade children, 15 to 20 percent need psychological attention right now. They are beginning to show signs of poor mental health. Among 15-year-olds, we can count on one out of every 20 being committed for psychiatric care before going much further in life. Among the 18-year-olds, that group of stalwart and courageous boys and girls upon whom we place so much of the burden of this world that we have been unable to carry, 10 percent of the boys will be so unfit emotionally that they will be rejected from military life. To be sure, girls are better adjusted than boys, but in neither case is there any cause for cheering.

Some studies show that there are fewer disturbing tensions in rural areas; at least rural children show a greater sense of personal security and freedom from nervous mannerisms. High school students who have friends are better off psychologically than those who are less popular. Friendship seems an important ingredient in the prescription for psychological stability. The brighter students have a higher level of mental health than those who are retarded. The old saw that one can be "just as happy as if he had good sense" is inappropriate because it rarely can be true.

The facts of the case are worth your investigation. The situation is now more savory than it was when smallpox and tuberculosis were rampant in the 17th century—or in the 18th when cancer and diabetes went unrecognized until they struck down at the end. We are today, in our understanding, prevention, and treatment of mental health problems, only a little bit further along than that.

Where does advance in the understanding of mental health problems begin? One who would understand must bring to the task a mind free from the prejudices and archaic ideas and be willing to admit that we are not very close to the ultimate solution let alone an understanding of causes of mental health problems. But progress is being made. For example, it is estimated that some 300 million children are living in underdeveloped areas on low-protein diets, starving for want of food in areas hit by drought. They may never be able to "catch up" mentally with their richer counterparts in other parts of the world. Dr. Winick of Cornell found direct evidence in humans that the damage to the brain of a human infant may be irreversible if malnutrition begins before six months of age. Early malnutrition, early disease, early neglect or child abuse are seen now as causes of serious aberrations of behavior in adolescence.

The early awareness of prejudice, for example, is now being recognized as one of the psycho-social causes of a childhood form of mental illness. The dawn of the awareness of ethnic difference (color or religious variations) leaves impressions devastating to later mental health. A case in point: Ruth.

I can remember Ruth so well—a charming and lovable 16-year-old whose parents moved to a strange town and put her in a public school. Soon she became ill, pleaded to stay home from school, was nauseated at the thought of school. Thoughtful people took over, found Ruth was meeting rejection at school for the first time, helped her develop a skill (no more complex than expertness at volleyball), and soon Ruth's mental problem vanished. Ruth's illness, you see, stemmed from her first experience with anti-Semitism, and her acceptance was restored because her classmates loved a winner more then they disliked a deviate.

Investigators find the study of the mental health problems of youth embryonic, fascinating, and promising. They are probing and experimenting, and it is reasonable to believe that some day we will understand—as some day we will understand cancer—the ways best to motivate a child, the influences of competition, the dynamics of group action, the ways to teach good behavior, the means of preventing the anxieties and tensions that lead to psychoses. Some day we will understand these things and be able to help children vastly more than we now can.

What are the currently apparent origins of psychological maladjustment? The study of them presents opportunities for studying relationships. One most certainly has to deal with origins before a plan of action can be developed. Most of the time the problem is to help the youngster who finds difficulty at a time, at a place, or in a set of circumstances that irritate. Many of these experiences in maladjustment are something like scarlet fever, or poliomyelitis; they come, cause great distress while they last, impair growth and retard development, perhaps leave some scar tissue. They may even be fatal. Their origins are important; the media in which they grow and the means of transmission are as significant as if we were studying communicable disease. One writer has described these causes as follows:

> There are probably no one or two big causes of poor adjustment among adolescents, such as great emotional shocks, malnutrition, or inherited defects. It is more probably that the causes are to be found in an accumulation of little things—small and repeated blows to the child's ego, small emotional hurts repeated over and over. These may add up to unrelieved anxiety, pent-up inferiority feelings, distorted impressions, warped attitudes, and emotional carryovers which are the substance of mental ill health.

It is the specificity of these origins that intrigues us in education. We know that the cumulative influence of the school experience has a bearing upon child health. One could not confine a child roughly five hours a day, five days a week, thirty weeks a year, for twelve years, to an environment in which he or she reacts to pressures, meets success and failure, is victimized by or gets along with others—an environment in which the child is led to believe that he or she will never amount to anything really important in life unless he or she is successful there. The school experience is powerful. An analysis of its day-by-day, hour-by-hour influence on a child's life will reveal how necessary it is for educators to accept their responsibility for their share of the mental health conditions found among our people. If the population is seemingly losing its sanity, then the school must look at its influence to see whether, during the formative years, it does as much good as it does harm.

Here is an area of study that can be commended to anyone interested enough to make an analysis of school life to find factors that unfavorably influence emotional stability. We must not deal with them in broad generalizations. We must not be content to say, "Competition is an evil factor; we must substitute cooperation for it." That is too much like saying "sitting in drafts causes colds," when no research on the common cold has as yet proven that statement conclusively. Competition is a tool to be used. It may be used unwisely in a science class and thus produce frustration and despair in the heart of a 12-year-old who wants greatly to be well thought of but who did not build as good a crystal set as someone else. Or it may be used wisely in the same class to spur the group on to revealing even more interesting facts of an assignment, because the children vie with each other to see who can bring in the most recent advances on the subject at hand.

Competition need not be condemned as such, any more than we condemn night air or starchy foods or vigorous exercise. It all depends upon how it is used, and thus it is these dependencies we must study, these situations in which individual children react to the circumstances that surround them and that must be explored. We cannot now accept the old familiar clichés like "spare the rod and spoil the child" or "let the baby cry—he'll soon learn not to" any more than we accept "an apple a day keeps the doctor away." Such generalizations are merely convenient "outs" for the one who is baffled in the search for an understanding of some particular aberration of child life.

We must be more scientific, more specific. We must come to understand and accept the practice of the differential diagnosis. We must be able to separate the many influences and experiences in school from each other and see them at work on a particular child at a particular time. This has been the experience in other phases of preventive or therapeutic effort; there is little reason to believe we shall escape such careful individualizing of our efforts in the mental health field.

When we see a child who is "nervous" or upset or a "problem," we must know that such personality traits did not develop overnight. A child does not develop these traits all at once and as a general quality of his life any more than he becomes honest or courageous or trustworthy all at once as some God-given, inherited quality. Youngsters are ushered into the world neither Protestant nor Catholic, honest or untruthful, fearful or courageous, deceitful or guileless. They have potentials to be sure, but without specific environmental influences playing upon them these potentials will not be seen. We are what we have learned. And if the youngsters hear the words "tattle-tale," or "chicken," or "be good," they do not know what they mean until they have specific experience in the circumstances described by the words. No child is naturally "nervous" in the sense that he has to keep biting his nails or tapping his feet or screaming at sudden noises. The feelings inside make children do those things, their reactions to previous experiences, the "build-up." The clue to rectifying is to study the child, examine his record, locate his emotional allergies, find the irritations that inflame them.

And what about the home? Volumes have been written about its influence. Tens of thousands of meetings have been held to aid parents understand their influence upon the health of their children. Presumably not one of them has been wasted motion, for the arrow points straight at the home as the place where the early influences are felt and lasting impressions are made. When parents stand by their children when the children are in difficulty, when they show by words and action that the child is loved, when they have fun together as a family, when they are consistent in the way they deal with their children, and when they are understanding of them, then the home creates the atmosphere in which children have the best chance of being well adjusted.

The home will have to be examined, like the school, to find those specific situations that make for tensions. The argument over the television set, the friction over race relations, the disapproval of a boyfriend, the constant belittling of one's efforts, the fear that the son will grow up to know more than the father—these and scores of others are the elements that we must deal with in the solution of adjustment problems.

Can we describe the broad outlines of a program that will favorably affect the development of good adjustment to this anything-but-comfortable environment in which we live? At the risk of being either trite or unscientific or both, let me suggest several characteristics such a program would have.

First of all, let us examine the sort of life we think is good. Do we want children to live in tranquility and peace? In friendship with one another where hatreds are gone and rivalries are friendly ones? Do we want them to respect one another, to honor their competitors, to develop an atmosphere of democratic acceptance and equality? Do we pray for the development of self-respect and security, which will produce confidence rather than ulcers, satisfaction rather than frustration? If we do then we must remember that these things are not learned or acquired in the abstract. We cannot *talk* a child into becoming democratic. The child becomes democratic by doing those things that are later called democratic, by living democratically in specific relationships. Thus, we must provide specific experiences in democratic living, concrete evidence that persons are equal, specific assistance in discriminating between an ungracious act and a sporting one.

If we believe it is best to become calm, composed, fair-minded, or poised, then we must temper the frenzy of an overstimulating school situation with its hyperthyroidal basketball tournaments, for example, its synthetic enthusiasms for so many unimportant things. One cannot preach ethics. They have to be lived. One cannot expect children to grow up to take charge of their lives if during the school years they are never given a chance to make a decision. One cannot appreciate the democratic way unless one lives it in a hundred different specifics each day.

Today's problem of bringing up a child in the way he should go would baffle a Rousseau whose concern for Emile was no greater than ours today. In this world of ours where the beauties of our natural surroundings are sometimes soiled by thievery and the waste of exploitation, in this world of immorality, hypocrisy, violence, subversiveness, and self-seeking, what values can we inculcate? What censure can we invoke when old-fashioned virtues are found missing? How can we seriously condemn aspiring young basketball players who yield to bribes when bribery and influence are commodities as freely sold as eggs and butter in the high places of our national life?

A second item in the broad outline of a program is the necessity of somehow making virtues as clear, as real, as understandable as vices. If we want favorable attitudes toward work or the church or parents, they should not be preached about or their values exhorted, but satisfying experiences with each in some understandable detail must be had. For example, nature seems to have made us all—dogs, cats, humans, and monkeys—to feel better if we feel superior, at least to something. If my plane did not fly faster than yours then my headwinds were stronger. If you are taller than I, well, at least my skin is whiter. If we have no television, we have two cars. We give the person who wants to brag a little hardly a chance to finish before we properly put him in his place by the recitation of our own achievements. Not even a good stirring account of how Uncle Sam wrecked our pocketbooks with his income tax is allowed to stand for long. Someone is sure to come along who suffered superior anguish and who is broke much flatter than we.

Growth and development refer not merely to long bones and bicuspids, but to egos as well. And just as tallness needs long bones and long bones need vitamins, so also does personality need ego and ego-development need superiority. We need to experience superiority in something. We cannot live inferior to everybody in everything.

But is there a difference between ego-development and egocentricity? Is there a difference between group pride and ethnocentricity? Can we find the clue here to the racial and religious tensions that figure so largely in our national life? Children are reasonably free from such bigotry, but soon the adult teaches them, in order to preserve their personal or group superiority, that they must be snobbish or prejudiced or that they must hate. Such anti-personal attitudes are evidence of illness.

The unhappy newsstand attendant in an Alabama railroad station, as reported the other day, who insulted a Negro who crossed over the Jim Crow line to buy a paper, is suffering. The Northwesterner who angrily states that his country isn't what it used to be because of the influx of "hunkies and niggers" is ill psychologically. Many who hold to mean, bitter prejudices, who nourish their snobbishness, do so because their lives are so impoverished, so lacking in personal culture that they greedily preserve their fancied superiority at cost to others. Here is a tremendous opportunity for concerted guidance from both home and school to unite in an educational program that will direct our native need for being superior into channels where it will not impede the development of others who have the same impulses.

Third, we must realize that children must be helped to develop ample resources for joy, for self-entertainment. To live a life wholly dependent upon the superficial stimulations of friends, radio, movies, ballgames, and the thousands of other forms of entertainment a community thoughtfully provides may be dangerous. We need inner resources for contentment, inner strength to support ourselves when we cannot rely safely on the quality of support provided by others. In books, in writing, in the arts and crafts, in games and sports are to be found such resources. The problem is so to teach or to guide children that they become happy or find satisfactions from and with things they find to do themselves, things they have created within themselves. How soon, for example, can we persuade the people in charge that the most important part of our great national effort in games and athletics is that which brings to every girl and boy some skill and joy from his own attainment and that the great championship spectacles, the bowl games and tournaments, are pleasant but materially inconsequential as solutions of some of our critical and chronic problems of youth? More money, space, time, and leadership for youth and community enterprises where millions can participate and thus find satisfactions are involved. Here, with the great majority of people is to be found the real problem—not with our stars and our professionals. Our youth need to cultivate their own resources in joy and not be denied their chance to learn to ice-skate, read or write stories, act out a part in a community show, or learn the fiddle or the zither, for their own, if not others', satisfaction.

Perhaps, in conclusion, we can catch the spirit of the best advice of the times when we summarize the needs of youth in the following statements:

1. All of us, young or old, seek status. We have to "be somebody" to be respected, to feel confident. If we cannot earn this distinction we will steal it, or fake it, or peremptorily demand it. This urge is at the root of many behavior problems and must be satisfied by providing children with spheres in which they can acceptably be superior to others in some respect.

2. When handicaps, organic or otherwise, doom children to disappointment, to a lowered achievement, one of the great contributions teachers can make to them is to help them find compensation by developing skill in other ways.

3. Our times seem to lead toward finding the cheap way, the easy out, the unearned security. Money is plentiful, wages are good. Neither our income nor our debt have ever been higher. Profits are astronomical. To make "an easy buck" is more alluring than to cultivate the enduring skills of competency or

patiently developed wisdom. It is more tempting to become a "wise guy" than wise person, and therein lies many of our problems of difficult behavior and delinquency.

4. Youth show clearly that they need something to tie to, something solid, something in which they can believe. They see national heroes with feet of clay; they doubt their freedom because our local witch-hunters make it dangerous to be free; they see a large portion of the world atheist and others confused and uncertain. Are there enduring virtues? We'd better make them clearer, more specifically clear to youth than we ever have. Can we substitute a belief in freedom and a faith in themselves for the fear, uncertainty, and cynicism found in many today? We can if we will work together. If teachers, parents, social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, religionists, and others concerned will work in mutual respect and confidence, without the petty professional enmities that thwart progress, we will favorably affect this great national problem. The development of child-study centers, school psychological services, mental health clinics, and other enterprises is urgently needed. The problem belongs to us all. Its solution will provide rich dividends to individuals and to our national welfare.

RELATED READINGS

Faculty of the University School. *How Children Develop*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1946.

Fenton, Norman. *Mental Hygiene in School Practice*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1943.

Hymes, James L., Jr. *Teachers Listen—The Children Speak*. New York: State Charities Aid Association, 1949.

Jenkins, Gladys G.; Shacter, Helen; and Bauer, William W. *These Are Your Children*. New York: Scott-Foresman Co., 1949.

Joselyn, Irene, M., M.D. *Psycho-Social Development of Children*. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1948.

Mangus, A. R. and Seeley, John R. *Mental Health Needs in a Rural and Semi-Rural Area of Ohio*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1947.

Mangus, A. R. and Woodward, R. H. *Analysis of Mental Health of High School Students*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1949.

Rennie, Thomas A. C. and Woodward, Luther E. *Mental Health in Modern Society*. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1948.

Woodward, R. H. and Mangus, A. R. *Nervous Traits Among First Grade Children in Butler County Schools*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1949.

A Challenge to the Professions

Many professional groups have a legitimate interest in the health of school children. Nurses, physicians, health educators (both school and public), dentists, physical educators, nutritionists, and school psychologists are learning to share their experiences, as they explore their common interest.

Here we meet in assembly. The purpose of this annual gathering is to practice together. It is like batting practice, when we help each other improve our swing, criticize the other fellow's stance, and help him level on the ball no matter who is doing the throwing, so that when the game begins on the home field we will be improved players as a result of our association with this organization.

The focus of our mutual interest is clear enough—the child, the young person in school, the growing and developing human being. We are all mutually concerned about the child's welfare. We want to see the child live a long and prosperous life, not struck down with polio or run over by an automobile or later caught in the web of an unhappy home life. We hope to be able, through our pooled efforts, to give the child sound counsel that will be useful and effective throughout life. We hope that as a result of our efforts the child will know better how to live a good life and meet problems intelligently.

Delivered at the general session of the American School Health Association, Kansas City, Missouri, November 14, 1955.

We are people with a shared concern. We seek the same ends. We want to achieve the same results. We combine our various talents to do a job unique to the 20th century—namely, to improve the quality of human life and living through the agency of the school. Schools here and elsewhere were, in previous centuries, relatively unconcerned about the learner, the child. They wanted the child to learn, to amass knowledge, to pass subjects, to read and write and figure. But the effort to give young persons a better purchase on their own life, to safeguard and improve its quality, is a recent, and disputed, concept.

Knowing what we know about the human organism, we are not greatly impressed with this former concept of a school. We know that many still think it exists solely to transmit knowledge, to recapitulate and deepen the culture, to improve communication among people. Others are content if the school develops those skills that will give the child a start on making an economic way in the world. We recognize those views. But we believe them to be limited, because we know that none of this business of education can go on successfully without taking into account the receptivity, the readiness of the whole child for it, and any educational program from kindergarten to university had better be planned with that in mind.

For us the outstanding fact, the fact that brings these professional groups together in a common bond, the fact that tells us we had better work together or else, is the fact of the oneness, the wholeness of the human being. Aristotle knew all about this. So did John Locke. But the poets of the Middle Ages and the clerics of the early church, and the scholars who dreamed up the unholy fictions about humanity would have none of it. They gave us the atomistic concept. They pulled the human apart. They separated humans into mind, body, and spirit and conceived the school as a place to train the mind. They glorified the spirit and degraded the body. They held in contempt those who concerned themselves with anything physical. Their lineal descendants are about us now, preaching the doctrine that schools need have no part of any mental health movement or that physical education is something unwanted and profane to the sacredness of an academic hall.

This separatist view has profoundly shaped American education. To my way of thinking it is the most influential of all the forces that have a bearing upon the American school. It has so molded the beliefs and understandings of people as to make it virtually impossible, in some school systems and in some universities, to place the things in which this association is interested in more than an auxiliary or caretaking role. In these places we are looked upon as competent babysitters while the main business of education is carried on by the Adleresque giants of an exclusive intellectualism.

Conversely, there are those *among us* who so believe in this ancient atomistic view that they believe a cardiac inferiority is merely a cardiac inferiority and has no bearing upon any aspect of personality development or intellectual attainment. To them a nurse is no counselor, merely a sterilizer, and a physician is merely an appendage to education who can reset the dislocated thumb, diagnose the impetigo, or issue the appropriate warnings to parents about mumps. I shudder to think what some of the atomistic physical educators think of themselves! They believe their principal mission in life is to develop, through exercise, a physical fitness based almost exclusively on muscular strength unrelated to purpose, drive, function, mood, or any other aspect of life.

None of those views in tenable. We sense that. But we must be *sure* of it. That is, we must be sure of the nature and meaning of the child's integrated state. It is only here that we find our strength in education. If we do not know this or if we are insecure in our conviction on this, if we as educators, physicians, and nurses are not impressed with the overpowering meaning of the fact of a human's unity then we had better start reading. We should read Hopkins,[1] and Witmer and Kotinsky,[2]and Angyal.[3] We should read Arthur Mangus on the social components of sickness and health,[4] and Kelley and Rasey's little book *Education and the Nature of Man.*[5] We should know Hartmann's *Educational Psychology*[6] for its discussion of the dependence of psychological phenomena upon the state of the body, and not to know Cattell's study of *Personality*[7] is to miss a great deal. Anything we can read on the correlation of psychic and somatic disorders, like Fetterman's article,[8] is illuminating. Alexander,[9] Flanders Dunbar,[10] Kluckhohn and Murray,[11] and Gardner Murphy's *Personality—A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure*[12] are standard works for any of us who earnestly want a solid footing for an appraisal of the kind of work we do.

To realize that the whole child comes to school, that the whole child is educated, that reactions spring from the unified organism, that however mathematics or history or physical education or a physical examination are received by a child they bear totally upon his or her development, is to make it clear that many kinds of professional people have to do with the educational process. The nurse is not merely an applicator of bandages, the physical educator not merely a bull in a china shop, and the physician not merely a dispenser of the Salk vaccine. The conception of unity as the basic nature of the human being not only assumes us to be of professional worth in the developmental lifeline of a child, but it opens up for us—if we will but see it and use it—an opportunity to make the school health team the leading influence in child development. If we will take time to learn about humans and not merely their parts, if we will see our problem not in provincial terms, if we will take time to find out what the educational process is all about, and if we will see what and who we ourselves are and can be—then we will achieve an inestimable usefulness to the developmental progress of young people.

If this usefulness commences at the point of complete understanding of the nature of the human being, then the second step is the exploration of our real and potential interrelationships. How do I relate to you—and you to me? If the nurse is struggling to deal with an accident-prone child, it may be that by working with physical education teachers some light on the personality inferiority that may dispose toward accidents can be discovered. Or it may be that a neuromuscular rehabilitation program can be instituted, which will go a long way toward reducing the number of accidents the child has.

If physical education teachers want to develop a thorough program of physical education for all children, not just some of them, they are dependent upon the physician and the nurse for historical and diagnostic background on each child as a basis for classification into the various parts of a modern program. No physical education program can be conducted without appropriate medical advice.

Maybe the physician is dealing with a psychosomatic situation originating in a rejection situation stemming from the social life of the patient. The physician should know the importance of sport skill as an "open sesame," as a counterbalancing acceptance factor. By working actively with physical education teachers, the physician may be able to solve the medical problem.

Surely no school dentist needs to be reminded of the personality implications of disfiguring teeth. Likewise, school dentists are aware of their importance to the health educator who needs information in order to teach young people something about dental care.

Children with heart disease used to be barred from all physical education. Now the physician and the physical educator come together to work out a limited or adapted program for the children with cardiac histories.

The nurse dealing with a fatigued child knows how antidotal vigorous play may be and urges participation rather than restrictions in appropriate cases.

The physician should be aware of the usefulness of the screening talents of nurses and teachers, because when such screening is well planned the contribution the physician makes is enhanced. Conversely, the nurse needs the penetrating and sensitive cooperation of the physician to deal not only with the pupil-patient but with the anxious parents who want straight talk and not evasion.

The relation of physical education and medicine alone is one of infinite possibilities. Cooperation, research, and understanding on such matters as bed rest versus early ambulation, prescription (individually, not by groups) of therapeutic exercise, the convalescence of cardiac and circulatory patients, convalescence in general, the use of exercise in orthopedics and surgery, in obstetrics and gynecology, and in psychiatry will be useful.[13] It is frequently suggested that we need to develop another specialty in the medical field comparable to the "sport doctor" in Europe who is adept at research and practice in the broad and fruitful field of sports medicine. In spite of the great numbers who participate in sport in this country, we have only nonmedical athletic trainers, a few medical advisers to teams, our school physicians, and a scattering of unorthodox others who pay some attention to the medical aspects of training, conditioning, performance, prevention of injuries, and the physiology of exercise. We all could use more shared information in this area.

The reciprocal relationships between classroom teachers, teachers of science or health, and of the researcher or clinical practitioner in the health sciences is classic. The history of the control of communicable diseases for which preventive measures have been found, of the control of deficiency diseases or nutritional aberrations, the record of public understanding and use of scientific medical services in general is a story of reciprocity. You supply me with the information, I'll pass it on, and together we will get the work done with a receptive public. Today we have a relatively well-cared-for public, medically and dentally speaking, and much of that is attributable to the efforts of the educator in schools and colleges.

There is a wealth of experience now available illustrating the importance of the team approach in solving individual and group problems. The electrical engineer and the pathologist cooperate in the construction of machines for inducing fever. The physicist and the gynecologist are indispensable to each other as they explore the use of isotopes in uterine cancer. The social caseworker, the orthopedist, and the corrective therapist make a team of experts, each sharing in the rehabilitation of the industrial accident case.

It should be clear that the team approach to the solution of some of our problems would be helpful. Perhaps we should start at the level of administration. There are many ways to organize and conduct a school health and physical education program in order to get maximum efficiency. Thus it would be reasonable to expect that pooled experience and opinion is better than one person's judgment as the group seeks for the best adaptation to the local situation. Furthermore, a group judgment is more likely to produce action than is a didactic "telling" of others what to do.

The pressing and constant task of curriculum construction in health education needs team judgment for most effective planning. It is wiser for many judgments to be used regarding what to teach to whom and when than merely the judgment of one expert. This seems difficult for some persons to understand. A few seem to believe that there is a body of information about health that every child should know and that all one has to do is wrap it up in neat grade packages and deliver it, preferably by the lecture method. Experts in curriculum know this is not so. They know that research on need, consultation with many who have contributions to make, participation by students in the planning, and group discussion are all a part of modern curriculum techniques. The "health team" has a group job to do here in a very real sense.

Certainly in dealing with a problem in the development of an individual child, there is just as much reason for us to pool our judgments as there would be in the illustration used from the field of cleft palate rehabilitation. The physical education teacher sees one facet of the problem, the nurse another, the physician a third. Together with the parents and teachers some synthesis of judgment can be arrived at that will probably be different from what it would have been had anyone gone it alone and that will have the added merit of being the product of multiple observations. This sort of approach to problems may cost more time and effort than the unilateral method, but in most instances it will make better sense because it will be more productive of sound results.

Here, then, is one aspect of our "challenge." A challenge is a "call to a contest of skill." The call asks us to become a team of cooperating persons, each making a contribution in terms of his best lights but, more important, each listening to and learning from the other and aiding in the solution—which may not be recognized as that proposed by anyone in its original form. We are challenged to seek a synthesis—not a choice.

This is difficult. This takes skill. It requires patience, study, understanding, and an intellectual modesty to permit us to be less inclined to insist on our way to the neglect of the merit found in the way of somebody else. It requires the elimination of some of our stereotypes by which we judge all teachers, or all physicians, or all nurses in a one-dimensional manner. How often, for example, have some of us been guilty of saying, "Well, there's no use even considering what the physical education teacher had to say. He's just a dumb coach intent on winning and cares nothing at all for the personal aspects of the student's life." Or, "The nurse? No, there is no judgment there worth seeking." Or, "Dr. School? No, if he were a good doctor he would be in private practice." These stereotypes and others like them have to be shattered. To divide the world into bad and good on the basis of judgments made on evidence gathered incompletely from a few experiences prevents growth and understanding and impedes the development of this team approach so badly needed in dealing with problems arising from school life. A physician will understand an educator better if he is willing to slip into the educator's shoes and try his argument on to see how it fits. And vice versa. It would be healthy indeed if we all would (a) spend part of a month's time reading up on the other person's field;

(b) spend part of every conference deliberately listening to the other person's view rather than try to show our own brightness by grabbing the floor and holding it against all comers; and (c) when the other person has little contribution to make be patient instead of condemning.

In such union there is strength. I heard a nationally prominent person say to a general session at a state teachers' convention the other day that he would remove from the school any work whatsoever in mental health, physical health, or recreation. He meant it. And he is not without influence in American education.

A beloved and respected dean of a fine liberal arts college asked the other day what the men in our university who do not make the varsity teams "do for exercise." It was a perfectly reasonable question, but it was asked in a context that made it clear he has virtually no understanding of what physical education is or can be in the educational program of the college. An examination of the required freshman curriculum of that college shows no mention of any instruction in health and nothing in physical education. The activities of the college health service are respected for the same reason we associate a veterinarian with any good racing stable. Someone has to look after the animals. In this college, the main business is the cultivation of the intellect, and nothing, or virtually nothing, that might inform the student in the realm of the art and science of living is of much count.

The worker in the vineyard of public health frequently has an easier time of it. He or she is better understood because he or she is protecting the public against its enemies and bringing to them information and action that they will accept or reject.

School health workers have an added problem. Not only must they get the acceptance or rejection of the student public, their ultimate consumer, but they have a middleman to satisfy and persuade. They must convince the teacher, the administrator, the dean that what they do with children is educational, not merely preventive or therapeutic, that their program advances knowledge and understanding, cultivates an intimate relationship with contemporary culture, and in every respect bears a kinship with the much-sought-after general or liberal education.

The basis for such a program in both its operational and philosophic sense is a thorough understanding of the nature of the child. We must persist in our efforts to make the true nature of the child known to all. The child must be seen as an entity, an indivisible totality. When the child gets his Salk vaccine he is not merely being inoculated for polio. He is being affected totally—his attitudes, his feeling of self, his knowledge of immunology, his relation to parent, family, and friends. This is the root. This understanding of child life—his basic nature and his subsequent nurture—transcends all of the specialities of all of us. It is wider and deeper than medicine, broader than all of education, more complex than nursing, and more inclusive than dentistry. Our only hope of understanding what a child is—and what can be done to aid and abet the child's best interests—is to read widely about him, study his life and his problems, and listen carefully to others as they bring their evidence to the conference table.

The years of evolution of the science and art of educating children is still in danger of being set back by the irresponsible and uninformed critics of modern education who would have us give up all except the classical reading, writing, and arithmetic. Scientists, philosophers, and the professional educator know how unsound, how wasteful, how contrary to the facts of human life this position is. The American people want the education of their children to be successful. They want their children to make the most of their opportunities. This means that the school must be as concerned about the ability of the child to *receive* an education as it is concerned about what is taught or what the child does with it. Concern, therefore, about the health of children—about the physical, mental, and social welfare of the child—is an absolute necessity in modern education. Programs directed toward this end are neither frills nor luxuries but are basic to the successful accomplishment of any program of education that aims to help the child become an effective person.

This is our challenge!

NOTES

1. Lawrence T. Hopkins, *Integration, Its Meaning and Application* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1937).
2. Helen L. Witmer and Ruth Kotinsky, eds., *Personality in the Making* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1952).
3. Andras Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (Commonwealth Fund, 1941).
4. Arthur R. Mangus, "Medical Sociology: Study of the Social Components of Illness and of Health," *Sociology and Social Research* 39, no.3, Jan.-Feb. 1955.
5. Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Rasey, *Education and the Nature of Man* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1952).
6. George W. Hartmann, *Educational Psychology* (New York: American Book Co., 1941).
7. Raymond B. Cattell, *Personality, A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950).
8. Joseph L. Fetterman, "The Correlation of Psychic and Somatic Disorders," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 106, no. 1, Jan. 1936.
9. Franz Alexander, *Psychosomatic Medicine—Its Principles and Applications* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1950).
10. Flanders Dunbar, *Mind and Body—Psychosomatic Medicine* (New York: Random House, 1947).
11. Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948).

12. Gardner Murphy, *Personality—A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1947), Part IV.
13. "The Relationship of Physical Education to Medicine," a paper prepared by H. Harrison Clarke et al. for the American Academy of Physical Education, 1953.

Guidelines for Teacher Preparation

We recognize that teacher preparation in physical education, health education, and recreation can and should never be standardized throughout the United States. Efforts to evaluate curriculums for the preparation of such teachers by the use of common denominators of measurement can be only partially effective because of the host of variables. The essence of these evolving three fields is one of change and improvement; it would be completely irrational to expect sameness. The preparation of guidelines becomes dangerous business. They must be presented with full understanding that their wisdom needs to be tested against the contemporary social and biological scene and also against the declared objectives and purpose of the institutions doing the preparation. We offer these guidelines, therefore, merely as points for discussion.

1. Professional students in physical education should know the difference between physical education and physical training. These terms are not synonymous, and although at one time in history they might have been used interchangeably, it becomes clear now that differentiation can and must be made. Physical education involves an abundance of thinking, self-guided action, evaluation of experience, analysis of consequences, and choice. Physical training involves patterned behavior, leader evaluation and response-to-command activity involved in drill but a minimum of thinking and self-directed

---

Delivered at the Midwest Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Detroit, Michigan, 1964.

activity. It relies upon exercise for physical development without regard for its total impact on the person. To understand the difference thoroughly, a student has to be prepared well in the educational literature of both the 19th and 20th centuries, selected for its pertinence to the purposes of education in general vis-a-vis the growing child in a free society.

2. Professional students in health education and physical education should be made aware of the contemporary emerging patterns for education in both format and content in order to adapt the curriculums in these two fields to the complex needs of the society which these emerging patterns are attempting to meet. This goal would also require a wide reading of the current literature relating to the evolving patterns of education in America. Students should know what is happening to the self-contained classroom and about the emerging curriculum formats for the future. They should know about the instructional projects of the National Education Association and should be acquainted with the activities of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and its Curriculum Commission. They should have a reasonable understanding of curriculum trends not only in our fields but in other fields in order to gain clues to the directions of curriculum evolution. There is no reason to believe, for example, that school and college health education and physical education, as now taught in schools and colleges, will remain in its traditional format or administrative context, nor is there any reason to believe that material taught now in health education or physical education will be taught 15 or 20 years from now. Therefore students should be prepared not to resist change but to accept it, not only to work along with it but to take the leadership in this kind of evolution.

3. Students in physical education and in recreation certainly should be better prepared to solve the emerging new problems in preparation for the use of leisure and should be able to make concrete responses to the needs of the white-collar unemployed, the unemployed adolescent, the housewife, and many other large segments of our populations whose leisure patterns are going to be altered as the passage of time creates new circumstances in the work-leisure cycle. They must be better prepared to introduce people to a wide range of interests and to develop appreciations, understandings, and appetities for outdoor pursuits and for art, drama, music, singing, playing, and dancing. They must be confronted with the problems involved in the development of a satisfying social life indoors as well as a life of activity in the out-of-doors. They must be made aware of the social, political, and industrial problems of urbanization as these problems encroach upon the use of space. Perhaps the preparation of school and college students in the activities useful to them at school and college age is insufficient; they must be made more acutely aware of leisure skills useful in adulthood.

4. We should strive for a rather pointed development of professional pride

and a consciousness of professional worth which will raise the professional student in our fields above the usual operational level where many of our people are now to be found. Our fields are now in competition with the quack, the proprietary muscle-builder, and the physical fitness "expert" who plies his trade without the scientific foundation our teacher preparation curriculums are capable of giving. It is not necessary for our graduates to be confused with the opportunist or the phony. Nor need we cooperate professionally with any and every local or national endeavor to develop or promote inadequate conceptions of the relation of exercise to the good life. Nor need we apologize for our efforts to relate the potential intellectual and social learnings inherent in our fields to the best cultural standards of our society. Our games and sports do not need to be conducted at the level of those who would exploit youth for personal or economic gain. Surely the student of physical education and recreation can be brought to see the significant relation between behavior on the playfield and behavior in our complex social milieu. Such problems as integration, rivalry, group hatred, and the search of the individual for worth can be highlighted as being clearly related to the experience on the playfield. Unless our students are impressed with these potentials, we miss a good share of the basic values of these two fields.

5. We should prepare athletic coaches and recreational leaders with an understanding of the serious and significant roles they play in our society. Too long have we failed to penetrate to the deeper meaning of athletic participation in the evolving personalities of the boys and girls who play. We have had enough evaluation by the scoreboard only. It is high time we began to cast our appraisal of both athletics and recreation in the more clinical terms of their social significance and their values in controlled adaptation to individual need. People will never take either athletics or recreational activity seriously until personnel in the fields take themselves seriously. Some day, it would be well, for example, to run some studies on the cultural contributions of sport or similar investigations of some penetration to match the endless reams of useless statistics on passes completed or field goal assists. In our search for excellence we have sometimes cited the competitive varsity programs as our answer to grandeur, but in so doing we have honored the ringmaster and forgotten the horses, made more out of the ceremony of presenting the cup than evaluated the effect of losing upon the vanquished.

6 We should hope that somehow we could inspire these students to read widely about this world of ours. Not only would they profit by broadening themselves as people, but they would gain deep and important insights into the significance and relationships of physical education to the human condition. This sort of reading, or listening, or travel would be mainly a cultural enterprise, not merely a "practical" or an improved way to master the balance beam or control the backswing. In the long run it would make better teachers out of

our people. Do they know Bernstein, Bergman, Martha Graham, William O. Douglas, John Cage, or Arthur Miller? Have they read *Profiles of Courage* or Edith Hamilton's *The Greek Way* or Viktor Frankl's *Man's Search for Meaning* or Huston Smith's *The Search for America* or maybe Eric Hoffer's *The True Believer*? Name two dozen more. Name oldtimers like H. G. Wells' *Outline of History* or Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*. Perhaps a grasp of social issues in American life can be obtained from the Weinbergs' *Attorney for the Damned—Clarence Darrow*. Could any of these fail to deepen the intellectual penetration of the student into the field of recreation, say, or the other two fields as well? It is out of such fabric that our scholars are formed.

These are suggested guidelines for the development of our curriculums in teacher education. Approval by NCATE does not mean we are at the pinnacle. The status quo is comfortable but limiting. The future in American education demands the steady and relentless destruction of sacred cows and the preservation of only the best in today's programs. The future will require new content, new administrative thinking, new ways of going about our business. We will be shot down if we do not keep pace with our changing society.

Section Three
Physical Education

A Holistic Point of View for Physical Education

From what I can gather, we share many problems in common as we attempt to develop a program of physical education for our respective lands. I can cite five of them at the outset:

1. What should the nature of physical education be in Australia and in the United States? Is there a particular type, a particular kind of program that will best fit our respective societies? Or are we committed to eclectic programs in order to satisfy the many diverse needs and goals of our people? Are there established national characteristics and purposes, biological or cultural, that should determine the nature of a physical education program?
2. Are there variations in the interpretation of the concept of the whole person that bear upon physical education?
3. Is or can physical education be a medium of learning, or is it merely a conditioning or body-building process? Do we seek to develop a program of physical education or physical training?
4. If physical education is developing in Australia as an eclectic program, trying to be all things to all men as it apparently is in the United States, what then is the relative place of games, fitness activities, dance and gymnastics, and all the other program components?

Delivered at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Melbourne, January 18, 1968.

5. Can the nonacademic stigma be removed from physical education? Is this a field of study worthy of university recognition leading to the traditional credits, degrees, and other academic symbols?

In the course of this presentation I shall be bold enough to present some thoughts bearing, perhaps, upon all of these with emphasis upon the third: is physical education, or can it be, a medium of learning, or is it merely a physical conditioning process interspersed with pleasant games to satisfy the competitive urge of the young? Are we talking about a program of physical training or a program of physical education?

It is my considered opinion that to the extent you and I see physical education as an avenue of learning, it will prosper in the world of education and become a significant experience in the lives of our people. To learn through the experience in physical education is the principal, the most significant, value within our power to arrange. It transcends in importance all others, even those of the popular objective of fitness, or of self, or national aggrandizement through supremacy.

Learning has been and is the first and most lasting outcome of the physical experience. The primitive learned from climbing or combat; the child learns from jumping rope or water-skiing. The adult learns from tennis or a walk in the garden. Movement has always been a means for the development of understanding of oneself and one's world. This form of education is ancient, primitive, native. It predates spoken language or art as a means by which humans transmitted their cultural and developmental language to the coming generations. Physical education is the oldest means of learning known to humanity. It has served through the ages because of the inevitability of its importance, and it has persisted in this role regardless of how our contemporaries may have constructed a temporal or secular institution that purports to educate the young in the eternal verities.

Why? Because the person, whether the cleric or the academician knows it or not, is whole. The person cannot be divided, is not divided, and no matter what fiction we may concoct about mind and body, physical and mental, academic and nonacademic, these dichotomies bear no relation in fact to the essential nature of the person. The fact is that the person is a whole, is one, a psychophysical organism capable of reacting in many ways to the many and various emphases of stimuli to which one is exposed in the course of a lifetime. The root of this wholeness is, perforce, the cell. Its metabolism, its activity, its quality determine the expression of the organism that is made up of these millions of cells.

I trust I need not labor this point with you or cite the overwhelming evidence for it. This wholeness is the outstanding fact confronting physical education today—in whatever country. To deny it, to overlook it, to ignore it is to set us chasing after secondary outcomes, oblivious to the central importance of physical education and perhaps afraid to take a stand on physical education as education. It is sometimes more convenient to deny our heritage and claim expediency and popularity through such obvious and simple values of fitness and victory. These two can be seductive mistresses, indeed!

Perhaps this timid point of view was well illustrated the other day by a graduate student in a physical education seminar who rather plaintively asked, "Why do we have to be concerned with moral and ethical and psychological and social problems, and not quietly be permitted to concentrate our efforts upon the physical development of our charges?" Such innocence is refreshing! Why not indeed?

It is this damnable fragmentation that has beset educational thinking for centuries and that persists to prejudice not only our students but our educational contemporaries. Fragmentation was the product of primitive efforts to understand humans and their world. It was helpful to develop categories, divisions, rubrics. So came the physical, the mental, the spiritual.

From that sort of fragmentation of the human being it was only logical that similar rubrics could be developed to categorize human knowledge. If the early philosophers and clerics could conveniently carve the person into the trichotomy and then proceed to develop the horrendous scale of prior values, with the spiritual resting safely on top and the physical on the bottom, then scholars could more conveniently explore one of these hypothetical categories without being overly concerned about the other two.

And thus the scholar in pursuit of knowledge assumed that the "intellectual" processes necessary to debate with Socrates, write a sonnet, discover the temperature of the moon, or rediscover the escapades of King Henry VIII were exclusively valuable and not to be confused with feats of strength or the derring-do of athletes.

Thus the "academic" life developed, and as knowledge broadened, information about the world became too much for one basket to hold. So now we have a plethora of categories—astronomy and ecology, rhetoric and literature, physics and chemistry, zoology and anthropology, geography and economics—each one alleged to be a "discipline," a discrete something well fenced in against the intrusion of enlightenment from abroad. What chance had physical education, which by its very name could not be an intellectual or scholarly discipline because it did not deal with things intellectual?

We have the Greeks to thank for most of this. In spite of the fact that we moderns are supposed to be indebted to those ancients for their prototypes of physical education programs, I personally am not overly impressed with their contribution to our understanding of humanity and the problems that confront us today. To be sure, the Greeks sought health of the body. They had extensive gymnasiums, palestras. They started the Olympic games. Yet there was something lacking, something missing. I think it can be identified, because it has lived to haunt us and to keep us from full acceptance in the so-called academic circles.

The Greeks did not consider activity *per se* as having potential within it for the enrichment of self, as a means of relating to others, or as a means of learning about one's world. It was essentially a conditioning process, useful as a caretaking or developmental device to put the individual in shape to make war, to be a good citizen, or to be a slave. There is no evidence from Plato or Protagoras or Socrates that would lead me to believe that they understood that the dynamics of experience in movement could contribute to the thinking process or, in fact, was a part of the thinking process. Aristotle and Isocrates were devoted to rhetoric as the way of education, and they would encompass physical training in their system only because they sought a sound body to be the custodian for the sound mind—or to produce healthy young people for slavery or war.

Right there we can put our finger on an image of us that has lasted 2,000 years. We were useful to the welfare, and not to the education, of young people. In the pattern of the trichotomy—body, mind and spirit—we were body, nonintellectual, nonacademic, nonentities!

But now see what is happening! The walls of educational compartmentalization are crumbling! We now have geophysics, economic geography, biochemistry, and political science! The discrete disciplines are disappearing as humans press on to a revelation of what they and their world really are. Old answers are no longer good. *Relationships are being discovered and understood.* A new format is being developed for the study of humanity and its world. The emphasis is upon the function, the happening, and less upon the structure and the *status quo*. Concomitantly, further intensive study of the nature of humans—their physiology, the relation of endocrines to personality, the physiochemical nature of psychological aberrations, the significance of psychosomatic relationships—all of these are destroying any remnant of the human as an "intellectual" being whose education can be based on knowledge and its mastery alone.

And we in physical education are, whether we like it or not, right in the middle of this development. The movement experience is being seen not just as a developmental phenomenon but as an educational one.

We are beginning to realize that because of the inescapable oneness of man, what he *does*, how and why he *moves*, where he *goes* have a bearing upon his education. When the little child learns to jump rope there is much more to the product of the activity than improvement in coordination and cardiac return. Whether on the balance beam or tending goal, something is going on in the brain of the participant. We can either ignore it or plan for it and do something about it—but we can't wish it were not happening. It is within this area of total response that the educational potentialities of physical education reside.

As the walls between disciplines crumble, so does the wall between the physical and the intellectual. *We will soon have to make a choice*. We will have to make up our minds as to whether we are a field of learning or just a perspiratory art. We will have to decide whether we are caretakers or babysitters for the mind or whether we are central to the total development of the person. In short, are we devoted to a physical training or to a physical education?

Those two are different. I believe we should take time to outline the differences. I am of the opinion, having had experience as both student and teacher with both physical training and physical education, that there is more than a semantic difference. The differences are real and demonstrable and bear upon the relation of our field to education as a whole.

To differentiate we must begin with some consideration of what education is. Not everyone in our world understands that the common thread of an education is the development of the ability to think. This is the central purpose to which the school must be oriented if it is to accomplish either its traditional tasks or those newly accentuated by recent changes in the world. To say that it is central is not to say that it is the sole purpose or, in all circumstances, the most important one, but it must be a pervasive concern in the work of the school. Many agencies help to achieve educational objectives, but this particular objective—thinking—will ordinarily not be attained unless the school focuses on it. In this context, therefore, the development of the rational powers of every student must be recognized as centrally important.

If you were to ask me to define what I mean by "thinking," I would borrow from the philosopher Kilpatrick, whose definition is simply "all that the organism does in advance of overt action to size up the confronting situation and make plans for dealing with it; during action, to evaluate the process and shift the means, if need be, in order the better to effect the aim; and after action to draw lessons for the future from the whole experience." There are, of course, other outcomes to be defined in terms of personal growth, recognition and evaluation of oneself and one's powers, the development of an orientation or relation to others, a liberation from imposed authority, and certainly the development of an adaptation to the culture in which one lives. These terms are significant and high-sounding but nevertheless real as we seek to guide the educative experience rather than to allow it to develop helter-skelter with no more assured outcome than the acquisition of knowledge.

Training, on the other hand, involves teaching, drill, or discipline by which the powers of mind or body are developed usually in preconceived directions or responses. The term is usually associated with the training of athletes or animals for specific performance to produce a response not necessarily chosen by the one who responds. Training does not involve choice upon the part of the one trained. Nor is it concerned with identity between the thing to be learned and the purposes of the learner.

Within this context then, what are the essential differences between physical training and physical education? I would like to describe the differences in four categories: purpose, orientation, method, and goals.

In terms of purpose, it has been traditionally clear that physical training aims to train the body in such tangibles as coordination, strength, physiological health, and endurance. It directs its attention to the production of the sound body as the vehicle for the housing of the sound mind. It admits the dichotomy of mind and body.

Physical education, on the other hand, purports to develop the whole person and is as concerned with one's intellectual, social, and ethical and spiritual development as it is with one's "physical" aspects. It recognizes no dichotomy. It sees the child as a person, not something to be exercised, not something to be dealt with in any fragmented sense. It realizes that what happens to a child happens all over, and it cannot limit responses to any given experience such as strength or endurance. A physical educator knows that such exercises designed to produce those limited objectives or purposes will nevertheless and inevitably have a bearing upon other aspects of the personality and the self-image of the participant.

In orientation, physical training becomes an end in itself. It seeks, through fixed and predetermined responses, immediate and measurable growth. The fitness score becomes the symbol of status. The skill of the performance becomes the end-all and be-all.

Physical education, on the other hand, recognizes that all of its activities are but means to an end, contributing to growth in function, to the enrichment of the quality of the personality, and to lifelong learning and participation. Physical education sees physical fitness not as an end in itself to be acquired, measured, and perhaps bragged about but as a means by which other and more socially useful ends of life can be attained.

In method, physical training has traditionally been authoritarian. It has used the response-command system of procedure. It has sought discipline—a discipline of response to one who gave the command and preconceived the kind of response thought necessary or desirable in the situation. It is the coach of the team calling the signals from the sidelines. It is the drillmaster ordering the class in calisthenics. The authority has characteristically been that imposed upon the student by force from the outside.

In physical education, we have sought the involvement and participation of the student in seeking the ends in view. It involves creative endeavor. It encourages problem solving. It has admitted students and their interests, purposes, and needs to the selection of the way in which the team is taught or the class proceeds. It is far more democratic than authoritarian in the way things get done. Motivation comes from the inside, and the discipline is a self-imposed one.

In goals, physical training has sought, as we have mentioned in our discussion of orientation, the short-range achievement of arrival at the fixed and predetermined state. Practice has brought the student to the norm. Sweat has been produced; strength can be measured; the test has been taken; the passing grade is given. The future relation of the student to the program is of minor concern.

In physical education we seek continuous activity independent of the short-range goals of the teacher, so that the individual is prepared, as one might be in the study of literature, for self-perpetuating participation for a lifetime. The goals are long-range. The physical education class in school is seen as only the instructional period preparing the individual to live the kind of a life that will fit into the culture. It is self-perpetuating, whereas physical training is self-defeating. It is not satisfied merely with physical attainments but, on the contrary, seeks the adaptation of the individual at the ethical, esthetic, and behavioral levels as well. If behavior in the social realm is a recognized goal of education, then physical education cannot escape responsibility in this area.

Physical education recognizes that one of the earmarks of an educated person is capacity for decision. The kind of choices one makes in various situations is a measure of one's ability to relate to the culture of the times. Thus, it seeks to teach through discussion, problem solving, example, and analysis those behavioral characteristics that mark the educated person in society.

Applied to the curriculum, physical training consists mostly of unimaginative, repetitive exercises of limited scope and directed mainly toward the production of response to command and physiological well-being. It is the mass exercise of military preparation. It is the marching and countermarching of the

European systems of the 19th century. It consists mainly of a set of activities many of which are extrinsic to the basic purposes of the growing individual and pay a minimal amount of attention to individual variations, needs, and differences.

Physical education, on the other hand, is characterized by a wide variety of activities chosen because they relate to the needs of the growing individual. The individual is recognized as different from all other individuals. Physical education turns the gymnasium and play fields into laboratories where a great variety of activities are taught, most of which we hope are intrinsic to the growing self and whose purpose are for the most part extroverted and not wholly related only to physiological return. It does not confine its activities to the gymnasium but uses the library, the out-of-doors, the discussion group in order to tackle those problems and to learn about those activities the outcomes of which relate to the totality or to the total development of the person.

Now I leave it to you to decide which of the two fits best into your concept of Australian education. I think I know which comes closer to meeting the needs of American youth, although I am not contending that we in our country have happily arrived at such a universal program.

I am fully aware of the fact that when I talk this way about physical education and emphasize the element of thinking that should dominate the response of the student, people are likely to ask, "Whatever do you mean by implying that there can be an element of thinking involved in such an experience?" This is not too difficult a question to answer when you realize the unlimited possibilities and opportunities therein, nor is it too difficult to illustrate the point when you realize that whether you like it or not thinking goes on in the experience. Our problem is largely one of assisting the individual to make the most of the opportunity to think. He *will* think. You can't keep him from it.

It requires thought, for example, to evaluate one's own place in relation to other competitors, to other people, to playmates, and to one's group. It requires thinking to establish value judgments with reference to the ethics of the game. It requires thinking to arrive at some reasonable analysis of one's part in the solution of a strategy problem or to chart a course for a cross-country run or to climb a mountain. It requires thinking to plan logistics for a camping trip or to solve an equipment problem. It requires thinking to write a choreography or to dream up plays to be used in a game. It requires thinking to originate a game, to choose leaders and captains, to solve one's personal problems of security and comfort within a competitive situation. And, of course, as one watches our school or public sports, one does some quiet thinking about the character of human nature while witnessing the behavior of crowds or competitors. There is no dearth of this sort of opportunity. The only questions involved are the questions of locating the opportunity to assist students in their thinking and to present them with time and opportunity to think the situation through in some kind of intelligent analysis. One can liken the teaching of physical education, therefore, to the teaching of dramatics. One has to develop not only skill in the art but also to analyze and understand something of the meaning and importance.

Were we to be successful in developing the full potential of physical education as an educative experience, we would have no problems with our academic colleagues. We would stand clearly revealed in our own merit and undeniably productive of significant value. But to attain that state, whether in your country or mine, the following developments will have to occur throughout our program:

1. We will have to have professionally prepared personnel. If we are searching for our function, seeking the fullest reason for our being, we have to begin with the functionary. Who is a teacher of physical education? In my country we are slowly eliminating the quack and the mountebank. We are slowly getting people with a university education and advanced degrees. We still have our jolly old swimming coaches who pose as physical education teachers or football coaches who enter the field with no sense of their educational responsibility. We still have quaint people with quaint systems of exercise or impresarios of exercise marts who claim to be the world's greatest physical educators!

I hope you have eliminated these people. If you haven't, you must. The time has passed when physical education can be a haven for washed-up athletes. Neither game skills, varsity medals, nor international athletic reputations are criteria for professional ability in physical education. The emphasis on preparing teachers must switch from athletic experience to a study of human life in its personal and social setting. Then comes a study of the skill of soccer or football or dance or whatever as useful tools from which to choose to get the best results in human development. The activity becomes the instrument contributing its share to desirable transformations in human personality.

An analogy to medicine is appropriate. One does not apply cobalt therapy, even though it is useful, unless the patient requires it. Neither football, nor soccer, nor dance, nor anything else is good unless it is inherently useful and taught in such a way as to contribute to the needs of the individual making use of the activity.

We need standards for the professional preparation of physical education teachers that are no less high than standards for other fields and perhaps higher than most. A four- or five-year preparation in physical education, with its full complement of study in child development, human biology, educational philosophy and pedagogy, social analysis of the culture of the people, are bases for understanding the uses for and techniques of teaching our enormously large range of activities. These are the tools of our trade, and to master these areas requires a university education, recognized with the usual educational trappings of degrees, honors, and credits. Any other treatment is a remnant of the mythical thinking of a bygone age.

But we, the physical educators of any land, must pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps. No one else will do it for us. The task of weeding out the quack, the uninformed and unprepared, is distinctly ours. People won't take us seriously until we take ourselves seriously enough to develop a solid professional group.

2. We had better quit boring people to death with stupid exercises and activities repeated *ad nauseum* and get down to the business of teaching a program that is intrinsically interesting and that will prepare for lifelong participation. We should make of the physical education period a rich experience—not a dull one—and no more of this clever business of taking boring exercises and dolling them up with music or whistles or funny commands or even prizes or penalties. We have bored people long enough with our ridiculous mystique of "the physical." It is time we made our classes rich with utility, interest, novelty, adventure, and involvement. Our classes should be fun, and they should have an emotional appeal in which the individual becomes involved with his or her own performance and that of others. May the good Lord protect us from these repetitive exercises we make children go through every period in the name of physical fitness, national pride, the President's physical fitness program, Rule Britannia, or whatever!

It is time to realize that a rich experience will lead to other experiences in the same vein. If they like what they learn from us, they will go on to be lifetime participants in something. There are far too many people who find physical education a terminal experience. When they are finally released from the requirement, they give away their sneakers! What a pity! What a pity we did not whet their appetites for further exploration of *something*—fishing, camping, climbing, skiing, boating, anything! A rich experience leads to a lifetime of exhilarating participation, to self-realization, not just as a child, but as an adult, to self-fulfillment, not just as students, but as adults and parents. We are talking, of course, about physical *education*, from which rich experience people learn, become educated. They learn to direct themselves to become self-contained and no longer dependent upon the arrogance of the drill master who counts the cadence and tells us which muscles to stretch and when.

3. Let us vigorously explore some of the new frontiers of physical educa-

tion. The four-minute mile was important, but so is some understanding of the relation of success in motor skills to the catatonic or disturbed child. Is there a controllable therapeutic procedure emerging from the use of the group situation inherent in sport that can be useful in the treatment of psychotic states? Evidence today indicates there is, and the use of an intelligently developed and scientifically applied physical education program in schools and hospitals for the disturbed is a field of rich promise.

Winning the Olympic games is great, and we will spend a few millions making sure our finest athletes do well at Mexico City; but it would also be fun to spend some money on exploring the relation of games to vision. The whole orientation of the blind to the environment can be favorably affected by a type of motor training involving identification of moving parts with the purpose of the expression. Reading skills can be improved as a result of improvement in motor coordination. We need to know more about the relation between active participation and scholastic achievement or what effect experience in dance will have on retarded children.

We know enough about exercise and strength to last us a long time. I wish we knew more about success in sport vis-a-vis juvenile delinquency or social interaction of *any* kind. Will vigorous forced muscular effort favorably affect schizophrenia or the establishment of an appropriate image of self? Will guided experience on the field of play improve social interaction? Let us find out and pay equal attention to something like this as we do to those two very pleasant divertissements for the highly skilled—the Davis Cup and the America's Cup!

4. Let us put "physical fitness" in perspective. What is the role of physical education in health and fitness?

I once wrote, speaking of the United States, that undoubtedly we need a strong populace for either a warm peace or a cold war. To guard the health of the nation is a worthy ambition no matter what our destiny may be. To control disease; to improve nutrition; to prevent mental and nervous diseases; to seek emotional, social, and intellectual stability; and to secure appropriate growth and development of children and youth become almost an abiding national passion. We are committed to such effort—and enthusiastically so. Our form of political life not only requires a nation of healthy citizens but guarantees them the right to be healthy.

So once again programs of physical education are being asked to step up the intensity of their purpose and the vigor of their content in order to save youth, and thus our country, from desuetude if not actual destruction! But we cannot do this by the simple expedient of re-emphasizing an atrociously unscientific but popular term—"physical fitness"—and seek to cure all the ills of the flesh by the application of a 600-yard run or a series of push-ups. This is what we have been doing. I hope you have not. The result has been a serious loss of prestige for physical education with a corresponding growth in health education, because the latter has recognized the whole range of developmental requirements of young people and has recommended broad programs for their fulfillment.

The need for activity on the part of the human organism has been well established. Documentation is unnecessary. The evidence is clear. The human is an active creature, and activity is important to growth, development, and survival. The need for exercise is here to stay.

But apparently nature does not care a bit how one gets the exercise needed. The form the activity takes is biologically unimportant as long as no harm is done. Run around the block, play football, dance a jig, or climb a telephone pole. The heart does not care. Muscle does not care. The rectus abdominus, which is a pretty important muscle in maintaining visceral order against visceral chaos, does not care whether it is used in basketball, bowling, or burglary, as long as it is used. If muscular strength is what we are after to correct the evil ways into which we have fallen, nature does not care how we get it—or at what price. Strength-building activities can be anything that builds strength, and thus they need have no other purpose, no other meaning, no discernible relation to anything significant except strength itself.

I am afraid this is the sort of thing that some of us are calling "physical" fitness—a sort of muscular development that comes from exercise and that can be used for any purpose at the discretion of the possessor. But scientists, philosophers, educators, and the better informed physical educators have proclaimed that there is more to fitness than muscle strength. A conference of such people in 1956 described fitness as "that state which characterizes the degree to which the person is able to function." It implies the ability of each person to develop most effectively his or her potentialities. And the conference agreed that fitness is maintained at a high level only if motivation is continuously present! This requires an inner desire. The activities that produce fitness must have meaning.

We must make sure that we see such fitness exercises and tests for what they are—usually exercises for strength, spinal flexibility, or endurance—and not assign virtue to them beyond their command. Such exercises do not guarantee values from the realm of the social or moral. The problem is to make the exercise experience an effective instrument of the life of ideas, human relationships, enriching recreations, and rewarding enthusiasms. To allow sport to serve other than socially constructive ends is to ignore the profound educative possibilities in physical experience. The crucial question is not whether we shall employ the physical but how we are going to use it. The choice is fundamentally never between the physical and the mental but how to acquire an intelligent attitude about each.

I think when all is said and done there are two things that bother me about this physical fitness business. One is that we know there are other factors: nutritional status, the presence or absence of disease, hereditary weaknesses, endocrine misbalances, mental health, and a dozen other psychophysical elements that have as much bearing, if not more, upon this thing we are calling physical fitness as does strength or spinal flexibility. The other is that we seem to be "making hay" out of the popularity of a myth. We are deluding the public when we claim our place in the sun because of our contribution to "physical" fitness, when we have just built our whole reason for being upon the holistic nature of the human. How can we claim fame because of our alleged contribution to "physical" values when we know such fragmentation to be illusory? What are we afraid of? If we cannot make our stand on the basis of the inherent value of our activities to total development, and not just claim refuge in "the physical," we ought to pick up our hockey sticks and go home!

I suppose if *we* knew more about humans—their biological as well as their psychological nature—we would be less gullible on this fitness business and thus be less liable to misrepresent the field to the others.

And now for a passing salute to our critics or our detractors! When one consults the record of social problems unsolved or looks at the number of school dropouts and other glaring failures of our educational systems, one is amazed at the temerity of our detractors. When one examines human needs and requirements, when one takes the trouble to learn something of the biological and psychological interdependencies and interrelatedness that characterize the human being, one can only be disappointed at the kind of treatment we in physical education receive.

One can only be amused and saddened at the prevalence of this spurious intellectualism that seems to hold that a person's greatest accomplishment is to transcend nature, to rise above it, to free oneself from the restrictions of the physical and biological. To be sure, humans are having great fun and great difficulty relating themselves to nature. The human controls the atom, pollutes the streams, eradicates disease, transplants hearts, levels mountains, and as a result, some gain the impression that the human is something special, something immune to the forces of nature.

But the human is not that at all. A person is but one more living speck upon and within the galaxy of nature's phenomena. The human *is* nature—one particular representation of it and subject then to all the conditions and requirements nature establishes for development and survival. Activity—and we represent the active life—is one of those conditions. Surely even the most haughty of our academic critics must, deep down, admit of the place of activity in the total development of any individual.

Any other view of us, of the place of physical education in the development and education of people, is a kind of intellectual anti-intellectualism. It is the informed person not being informed enough. It is the expert not knowing the origin of his or her expertness or the conditions under which expertness is developed.

The intellectual belies intellectualism by displaying an ignorance of human nature through a wish to perpetuate the mind-body dichotomy. There is no surer delusion than to believe that intellect can be developed in the so-called tough academic courses, and those alone, while the "social" and "physical" aspects of youth are deliberately left out of the "academic" curriculum.

Such a position defeats the very purpose of the critic and, if followed to its ultimate conclusion, would bring the whole structure of this spurious intellectualism crashing down in a chaos of frustration, nervous breakdowns, and maladjustments. There is no surer fact in all of life than the dependency of the intellectual processes upon the physical for their functional adequacy or efficiency. Let it be known over and over again that the quality of learning depends upon the quality of the tissue doing the learning, and we in physical education have a great deal to do with the improvement of quality in living tissue. Nor can a student of human life ignore for a minute the inherent contribution of motor or movement experience to the development of wisdom, understanding, awareness, and most of all to self-realization. The human being feeds on something vastly more complex than protein molecules or differential calculus, and if we want the person to survive, we had better provide this required nourishment in both school and home.

We have a great contribution to make to students. I hope you enjoy making it and they enjoy receiving it. Our principal obligation is to the student. We need to help students look inside themselves, to examine their own thoughts and feelings, to help them confront and not evade their own anxiety and loneliness, to treasure the idea and the hope that is theirs alone. The total development of the individual must be the ultimate goal of an education and thus the ultimate goal of each one of us.

Our niche in the educational world may be insecure in spots, but philogenetically it is as sound as a dollar, complete as life itself, baffling in its resistance to evaluation, but of value to students beyond our present understanding. One can only hope that the Lord will help us to deserve the esteem in which we hold ourselves!

Idealism and Its Meaning for Physical Education

The most practical thing a physical educator can use is a philosophy. With it we can evaluate what we are doing against what we are supposed to do. A philosophy gives direction, keeps us on the track, keeps us honest in our endeavors.

Without a philosophy teachers are likely to flounder. They rationalize. They wander from pillar to post choosing activities and using methods that suit their fancy. They are not sure where they are going. They are headless horsemen.

This is not a discourse on the usefulness of philosophy. It is an attempt to illuminate the meaning of one philosophy—idealism—to the practicing physical education teacher. Idealism is a way of understanding that centers on the reality of an idea, the reality of the mind. The idealist believes that all we know about nature comes to us as a thought or idea, and that reality therefore exists in the inner experience of the person.

It began with Socrates and Plato. It receives strength from the Judaic-Christian concept of God. It was amplified by Descartes and Spinoza in the 17th century, and Immanuel Kant in the 18th gave it great force. In America, such thinkers as Emerson, Everett, Mann, Bernard, William T. Harris, Josiah

---

Delivered to the History and Philosophy Section of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 19, 1961.

Royce, and a great number of 20th-century educators have advanced the cause. Mary Whiton Calkins (1863-1930) does as good a job as any in summarizing the structure of idealism when she holds that the universe is our all-including self and that this self perceives, thinks, feels, and wills. It is a responsible phenomenon and not a creature of an all-dominating nature, submissive always to natural or supernatural forces.

What, then, does this have to do with education in general and physical education in particular? Obviously, and in the first place, any such program of education choosing to relate to idealism will be idea-centered. It will not be centered on the child or the subject matter. The idealist has some notion of what is absolutely good and that it is possible to base a program of education upon the goodness of God. This is idealism in education. Let us see if we can present its meaning to physical education in relation to (a) the learner, (b) the learner's values, (c) the objectives of a program, (d) the curriculum in physical education, and (e) evaluation.

The learner. Idealism cannot condone or support any form of education that conceives of the human being incompletely or inadequately. If we in physical education perceive the human as body only as a biological organism responding only to "natural" forces, then idealism holds we are wholly wrong and shortsighted. The human, to the idealist, is real, but only when the mind and soul are included. The idealist believes that the human is related to an order of things broader than the biological, that intelligence and reasoning relate to God, and therefore if we in physical education wish to do the greatest good for the individual we will treat the person as something besides protoplasm to be molded and stretched and made flexible and "physically fit." The idealist challenges us in physical education to teach moral and spiritual values. The idealist believes that the "body" is merely the physical expression of the nature of the soul, and thus our concept (in physical education) of "build," strength, physical fitness, symmetry, performance, posture, contour, and such are meaningful and important only when it is understood that they are of no significance of and by themselves. They are not ends. They are to be developed not for their own sake. *In fact, any development of them at all is contingent upon the purpose and direction of their use.* They must contribute to spiritual ends. This makes many of our slogans and shibboleths empty words indeed!

As H. H. Horne says, "Education must abandon the theory that the mind is an isolated entity caught in this mundane sphere and detained in the body as its prison house, in the favor of the theory that mind and body together constitute one organic unity." [1] There is nothing new in that, but I suggest *it is the most powerful concept* ever to bear upon what we do in physical education. It traps us completely. It holds us firmly by our holistic throat and denies us forever the doubtful privilege of not caring what happens to our charges as long as they grow strong or perform well. It slams the door forever on the cult of muscle.

Self is a multiplicity but a unity nevertheless, and the sum of the parts is less than the whole because there is a quality to the whole that does not reside in any part. If these things are true then nothing we can do in physical education may be judged by less than its effect upon the spirit of humans. We had better watch our step when we enthusiastically back a massive program seeking physical values without intelligently gearing these values into spiritually and morally acceptable behavior.

Values. Idealism holds two values rooted in existence: persons and the moral imperative. Children are persons; players are persons; students are persons. They are minds, personalities, souls. They are ends. They are not means.

Our students and our players are not chattel for exploitation, not tools to be used to further *our* ego or reputation, not people to be shoved around, ordered, whistled at, booed, ridiculed, scolded for reasons of ours and not theirs. The exploitation of school and college athletes of today for ends not theirs would make the great Kant shudder in his grave, because it was he who challenged us to "act so that in your own person as well as in the person of every other you are treating mankind also as an end, never merely as a means."

Let proponents of post-season Bowl games, all-star games, state tournaments beware of this philosophical indictment. If all selfishly ambitious coaches and sadistic "gym teachers" were judged by this point of view they would vanish in the turgid atmosphere of their self-generated hot air!

The idealist recognizes evil not as self-subsistent but as a necessary possibility in a world where individuals have the freedom to realize the good. If the good is centered in the spiritual self and the individual is the ultimate moral value, then anything we promote in physical education adverse to human interests is immoral. The lust for money, for status, for victory at the cost of welfare; expressions of anger; the casual approach to violence (as Norman Cousins would have it)—these manifestations are evil because they deplete the self.

Idealism holds that the moral imperative to do good is a part of the nature of humanity. Humans may be confused, while they are young, as to just what "good" is. Children may not know what "fair play" means. They have to be taught. But if they are taught, the idealist holds they will readily respond. For to do good, to avoid oppression, to teach fair play, to cultivate respect for others, to conduct our contests on a high level of sincerity and integrity is to obey the moral law.

Objectives. As our own Educational Policies Commission put it a few years back, if the supreme moral value in education is man himself, then objectives in physical education tumble into place rather easily. Their enumeration would clearly distinguish between means and ends. Strength and body development would not become objectives. They would become only means of aiding the student to capture a realization of truth, beauty, and goodness. The spiritual ideals of the race are the true objectives, and to attain them should command the energies of all teachers. As President Bixler of Colby states it, the basic purpose of education "is to help the learner distinguish the good and beautiful from the cheap and the shoddy." Where in the day-by-day conduct of physical education do we find tangible effort to accomplish this?

Actually, as measured by this idealistic philosophy, our programs from top to bottom would profit enormously if we were to strengthen them in these respects. We confuse means with objectives, fall short of true goals, become satisfied with scores instead of character, and stumble aimlessly along muttering something about health for health's sake and the game for the game's sake. We beam prettily when we test a million children with a dynamometer but fail to construct a solid program of total development to orient the test scores through some kind of relation to things that are really important.

Curriculum. The implications of idealism for the curriculum are endless. We have neither the time nor the space to mention them all. I shudder to think what would happen to some of our hard-headed traditionalists if we ever took this philosophy seriously.

In the first place, because idealism sees society not as a collection of individuals but as an organism in which individuals participate, it would endorse enthusiastically student participation in the planning of curriculums! Teachers and students would work things out together.

In the second place, although idealism emphatically insists upon the freedom for self-determination, it insists that such self-determination take place within a matrix of social concern, with society providing the medium for nurture and development. If this means to look with skepticism upon some of our individual activities that turn an individual inward, provide little or no experience with the interplay of social involvement, teach one to be a stuffy egoist, then perhaps these activities can be played down and some of them eliminated in our curriculum. Weight lifters please note!

But mainly, I suppose, the idealist—being a skeptic at heart—would not accept any curriculum or activity just because it had been used for a thousand years or because somebody wrote about it in the *Journal*. Weight-lifting for girls, obstacle courses, free-hand calisthenics, marching, anything traditional or bizarre is looked at with a fishy eye and must be justified in the curriculum in terms not of sweat, usage, or history, but in relation to the idealistic objectives already stated. The idealist is not an eclectric; the idealist abhors both minestrone and borscht!

The idealist would surely make room in the curriculum for the teaching of social, moral, and spiritual values, and leave them neither to chance nor imitation. The idealist believes that the teacher must be worthy of imitation, but because it is so much easier to be evil than good the idealist would have us make room in our curriculum for discussion, analysis, and decision making in the area of sportsmanship, ethical choice, and moral behavior.

And the idealist would throw into limbo any teacher of physical education who usurped from the players the right to think. Perhaps this is method, but it may also be curriculum. Modern big-time football to a full-blown idealist must appear ridiculous! As Donald Butler says in *Four Philosophies* (1957), "Since it is the self-activity of the pupil in which genuine education and development take place, he wants the student to be confronted by decision and selection as much of the time as is practicable. Certainly, he does not want the pupil's will crippled by having his decisions and selection made for him." [2] Signals from the bench in baseball and football and those intensive huddles in basketball where the "mastermind" masterminds too frequently place decisions in the wrong hands.

But activities encouraging creative expression, problem solving, and effort expended because something is inherently interesting and challenging—these would receive the blessing of the idealist. The idealist would encourage discussion of provocative questions, resolution of alternatives as the basis for behavior, and the use of questions not so much to find what the student thinks as to cultivate the student's judgment.

Evaluation. The principal outcome cherished by the idealist in evaluating a physical education program would be the development of self-propelled continuous activity when school is over. Idealism says that learning takes place within the self of the learner. This is not very different from the doctrine of pragmatism. Both would reject performance in physical education that is merely the result of command. Idealism would measure the outcomes in physical education by the amount of self-education developed and used, not merely by changes in the behavioral process but by changes all the way through the self involving conviction and reflection on meaning and value. The idealist would not be happy with any evaluation that merely showed statistical results. The score is not a true measure of success, nor are data showing the number who "came out" for intramurals. The fact of a million children having been tested for something is less than meaningful; it actually would arouse suspicion about the educative validity of the enterprise. The idealist's measures are not quantitative. The idealist waits to see what changes are made in the self.

And that, in essence, is the key to idealism. Self-activity leading to self-development involving the total self is to the idealist the important thing. Physical education falls well within this philosophical concept as it applies to education because of its obvious and very significant potential as a strong contributor toward understanding of self.

NOTES

1. H. H. Horne, *The Philosophy of Education*, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1930), p. 37.
2. J. Donald Butler, *Four Philosophies*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1957); p. 259.

The Relation of Principles to Practice

Physical education, like any other essentially activity curriculum, needs a carefully drawn set of principles as guides to its development. Without them there is danger of losing sight of what the activities are for. There is danger of picking the activities without much concern for their bearing upon the student. Without using principles as a guide one relies upon pragmatic experience, and "it works" becomes the criterion for selection of content and for administrative practice.

But the wise person in physical education knows that almost anything will "work." Success is not always justification for use. In a field heavily weighted with administration or "practical" matters, the temptation is real indeed to judge any curriculum or any practice by its workability rather than by its purposes or its effects.

For many years the teaching of physical education required little thought or planning. Little else was necessary than to step in front of the class, blow the whistle, and start giving commands. That kind of a teacher could be prepared in a year. He needed only a good voice and a bag of tricks.

But in the 20th century people ask certain questions—not only of education

---

Published in the textbook *Physical Education*, revised edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

in general but of physical education in particular. What are the purposes of these activities? What is the student thinking about? Does he learn anything? What does physical education have to do with cultural values? These and a host of other questions require answers. Physical education has to look inward to see where it stands. It realizes that its routine practices need justification in educational terms or they must be abandoned. They must be examined critically to determine their purpose, and their purpose must jibe with man's nature and his social goals. Moreover, the program must be rooted in the same soil as the best in all of education.

This view requires the formulation of purposes, of principles, of theory. It forces the physical education teacher to look at any activity critically in terms of its effect upon the total development of the student, and then, if the criteria in theory or principle are met, to teach the activity so as to attain the expected outcomes.

There should be no confusion about the relation of principle to practice. No activity is valuable, none can be trusted, until its purpose can be established. No program can be recognized as good until the principles upon which it is based are known. Practice without principle is a headless horseman. The practical person who scoffs at theory knows not where he is going or why. He merely teaches to occupy the hour and lacks the vision to see potential directions. The theoretician, or the one motivated and guided by principle, will always be the master because theory has always been the guide, the forerunner. Theory is the force, the genesis, of most of the world's planned development. Occasionally, to be sure, someone stumbles onto a way of doing something, on an invention or a discovery, without knowing why or how he did it. But for the most part developments in science, industry, or education proceed in some planned manner leading from a hypothesis or theory whose implications are being explored. The theoretical physicist has been the guiding spirit underlying the portentous recent developments in explosives. It was to test a theory that most of our immunizations were produced. Washington and Jefferson and Hamilton gave voice to broad generalizations and basic principles which found practical expression in laws. The steam engine and the rocket ship existed first "on paper," in the mind of a theorist who later guided the hands of "practical" people as they worked out the idea. To operate from a theory or a principle is the way of intelligence.

Physical education has suffered from too much "practical" reasoning and not enough response to thought and principle. Its history in our schools is littered with the mistakes of those practical people who have turned their backs on progressive developments and who have been content with doing something year after year merely because "it works." Usually, when one hears the veteran teacher say, "Well, that sounds all right in theory, but it won't work in practice," one can wager that he has only half-heartedly tried to make it work in practice. The proof of the validity of a theory may not be had until something *does* work in practice, but the chances are that that frustrated old-timer is really trying to say, "Don't bother me with any new ideas. I'm too comfortable the way I am." Only yesterday, some older teacher said to a younger one, "Your theories are fine but they won't work under today's conditions." That is being said over and over in spite of the fact that young teachers with enthusiasm and imagination are making their theories work time after time.

Particularly vicious, however, is the type of thinking which permits one to hold on to a practice after all the logic, all the reasoning, point to it as in distinct violation of good theory and principle. The exploiters of schoolboy and schoolgirl athletes, for example, care little for fact or principle. These athletic racketeers will overdevelop football, not in the best interests of boys, but for their own glory and vain satisfactions. Community boxing tournaments are still scheduled in spite of all the evidence to show how harmful, even murderous, boxing is. The gloves are not golden but the advertising value is. The boys who batter themselves into insensibility do so to provide sadistic thrills for spectators and a smug satisfaction for the sponsors. The latter can tell of the good they do in the field of public recreation! Practical, indeed, but devastating to human tissue!

Or perhaps it is the coach who schedules 32 basketball games a season, or a dozen or more football games, or who pits the undermanned squad against the Big Team just to make some money. Of all the parts of the broad field of physical education which have magnificent possibilities for good, the field of schoolboy competitive athletics needs most of all the courageous administration of high-principled men and women who know what they are doing and can tell you why. And yet, too frequently physical education is judged in the eyes of both the public and the educator by the activities of the professionally unprepared spokesman who administers a program not by planned, thoughtful, and rational action but by the rule of expedience and experience. That situation is comparable to gaining an impression of the area of psychology by believing the words or admiring the practice of some phrenologist. Or of judging medicine by the standards of chiropractors or witch doctors. Physical education cannot fairly be judged by the activities of the small group of unprincipled fakers who advocate some exercise or other or who conduct athletic programs for commercial rather than educational ends.

The ideal would be to conduct all the various aspects of a complete program according to principle. Within such a program nothing would be done solely for expedient, practical, or popular reasons. It would first have to meet the test of its relationship to a sound principle. "I agree with you in principle" would become a commitment to find the practical answer which would exemplify the basic purpose involved.

The modern physical educator is obligated to develop from the study of the nature of the needs of man a set of principles or theories which, when cultivated in practice, will produce the ideal type of program. That is the invitation to the young teacher of today.

Did the men of De Soto and Balboa and Champlain, as they roamed the forests of continental North America in the 16th and early 17th centuries, play any games, or sing any songs, or dance any dances? Did the colonials at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock and Barnstable bowl on the green or do their version of the Virginia reel? Very likely they did. Very likely the early exploring parties as well as the permanent settlers brought along as part of their way of living some games and sports better to express themselves and to add to the enjoyment of living. From that meager beginning, from the occasional wood-chopping or corn-planting "match" of the New England farmer, from the thin trickle of country dances allowed by the pious fathers, there came the torrent of more vigorous sports of a more leisurely populace in the 19th century. Bowling and baseball, football and basketball, winter sports and tennis and golf, took hold and children began seriously to learn to play. Now in the 20th century the student of cultural anthropology has to reckon with our devotion to games, to dance in all its forms, and to sports which currently command the attention of millions of Americans.

One cannot help but ask why. Why do millions of children play marbles or jump rope every spring? Why do millions of boys take to basketball every winter with an enormous zest? What is this force? What can be done with this phenomenon? The student of physical education wants to perpetuate it. He wants the oncoming generations to learn the same recreational pleasures. He sees their value to individual development. But he also sees within them something more. He sees how they may be used to affect the character of society. He sees them as an educational medium in which there is an interaction between the individual and his group. Not only does the young girl or boy "come into increasing possession of himself and his powers" through these experiences, but the character of his expressions within the activities shapes the kind of society in which he lives. His education then—that is, his physical education—relates to the quality of these experiences and extends our conception of education beyond the passive acquisition of knowledge about his world. He becomes a participant *within* the world, and his teacher becomes his guide and counselor as they seek to control the quality of the experiences.

When the modern physical education teacher reads of Dewey's belief that "all education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race," [1] he recognizes the play situation as immensely laden with social implications. He thus is convinced that he must somehow organize and control the situations to produce acceptable educational results.

He is further impressed when he ponders the meaning of Dewey's comment that "the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child's powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself." [2]

Such statements give him a clue to the location of principles. He seeks their origin and he knows where to look. He must analyze life the way man lives it, which means he must analyze (a) the way man constructs his society and (b) man's own nature. If he can derive facts from these analyses, he can construct principles; and if he can construct principles, he can operate a directed program because he will know what he is doing and why.

An analysis of the social structure (i.e., social, political, economic, ideological) of a community or nation will give important leads as to the kind of physical education which will serve the purposes of the people. In a democratic society one would expect physical education to be conducted democratically. In a regimented society one would use physical education to further the regimentation. In a nation geared constantly to war there would be a strong resemblance between physical education and military preparation. In this volume we have been speaking of a physical education geared to the peaceful pursuits of a democratic society, and hence, to review, we find some of the following characteristics available for translation into principles for physical education:

1. *Equality of opportunity is sought.* The Declaration of Independence proclaimed that. It declared all men were created equal, meaning equal in their title to opportunity—to educational opportunity. Physical education responds by establishing the principle of equality in the program, by opening its facilities to all, by providing instruction for all. It responds by recognizing the dub as well as the star, girls as well as boys, by helping each to seek his avenue of expression, excluding no one, giving excellence its due but sacrificing no right of the poorer in ability to extend the competence of the already superior. It disavows special privilege, seeks to "give every man his chance," and reduces the playground bully to a stature commensurate with the others. The great documents of the nation proclaim such equality as the "veritable fact of the days in which we live," and thus physical education can only be subversive if it denies by its administration or teaching the right of all to an equality of opportunity.

2. *Democracy promotes the general welfare.* The general welfare places individuals above institutions. "There can be no such thing as the welfare of 'the state' at the expense of, or in contrast with, the general welfare of the individuals who compose it. Man is not made for institutions. Institutions are made by and for mankind." [3] Physical education responds by adapting the program to the individual insofar as it possibly can. It seeks the individual's welfare. It creates a program suited to him and does not ask him to sacrifice his

best interests for the good of the program. It believes in "team spirit" and "team loyalty" only as long as such a miniature "state" does not require performance at the expense of his general welfare.

3. *People prefer individual enterprise to regimentation*. Other forms of government are distinguished from democracy by their reliance upon force, upon regimentation, upon the response of people to the commands of the rulers. Democratic people prefer to govern themselves, order their own lives, and enjoy creative self-expression. Physical education responds by rejecting the response-command type of activity, by seeking spontaneity and student initiative. The teacher becomes the guide, not the drillmaster. Mass exercises and blind indoctrination both disappear, and proposal, discussion, and popular decision become the vogue.

4. *This democracy pursues happiness*. The Declaration also proclaimed that. It gave to the individual the right of pursuit of happiness and thus placed its attainment high on the scale by which we "judge the effectiveness of social life." Such happiness "is that abiding contentment that comes from a complete and abundant life, even though such a life includes, as all lives must, both success and failure, prosperity and adversity, sunshine and shadow, cradle songs and funeral hymns. To be happy, we must know the realities of life, whatever they may be. We must be able to understand relative values in the midst of confusion, to seek the deeper meanings beyond the shallow, to desire worthwhile achievement in the midst of much that is trivial." [4]

Physical education responds by conducting a program where such elemental satisfactions may be had, where success and acclaim are more dominant than frustration and anonymity. Physical education believes in providing opportunity for each to achieve success according to his lights and through his own efforts to attain happiness. It seeks joy, fun, contentment, pleasure. It hopes to avoid those situations which provoke anger, resentment, or sorrow. Its games thus should be conducted in an atmosphere of friendly rivalry in which the values derived are from the game and not from the anguish of the defeated opponent. Physical education seeks to bring to all a large measure of basic happiness by providing rewarding skills in activities which are meaningful to the individual.

5. *Twentieth-century America tends to place human values above the material*. The days of the great land grabs, the exploitation of natural resources, and the sacrifice of human values—in fact, human beings—to the attainment of wealth have passed. Our social institutions now seek ways of conserving not only the natural resources but human resources as well. Human values are now important. People cling to religious concepts. They educate for character. They pride themselves upon seeking no territorial aggrandizement through war.

They seek only that free people may live in peace. To enrich, preserve, and prolong human life has become an important goal of our society.

Physical education responds by studying what the "average man" seeks. It knows he wants something satisfying, something to cheer for, to brag about a little, to take pride in. Physical education recognizes that he wants to be a little bit different from the rest, a little bit distinguished. So it teaches him a wide variety of activities, hoping he can become distinguished in one or more of them. It knows he abhors the monotony of health "exercises." He does not want health that badly. He is one not to be content with a miserable *status quo*—with boredom, or poverty. He seeks the good life, and if a tennis court figures in his calculations he is likely to get it. The physical educator knows that books were written *after* man learned to read, so he teaches people to play tennis, knowing that the provision of the court will very likely follow.

Modern physical education values more the good which comes to the competitor than the size and value of "the gate." It dislikes exploitation. It disapproves of using children for ends other than their own. It prizes human welfare over commercial advantage or the inflated ego of the promoter or alumnus. In so prizing it comes closer to the basic purposes of the democratic way of life.

6. *Respect for personality is the central social theme of the democratic way.* If the concept of democracy involves a cluster of ideals, then education becomes the principal effort to "actualize the social ideals into human behavior." [5] People must be taught to act in reference to each other with the respect born out of a high appreciation of the value of human life. Physical education responds by believing that above all other values, above the victory, above strength, above skill, the quality of the interpersonal experience is paramount. All else is secondary. The principal aim, the prior objective, is to teach people to get along with each other in mutual respect. Only thus can physical education most closely be related to the central theme, the chief ingredient of the democratic way.

7. *Our culture prizes its freedom.* Our colonists came to North America to find freedom. They knew what they wanted. They wanted freedom of choice, freedom to come and go, free boundaries, free schools, free speech, and freedom of religion. These were compelling things. And in the years since colonial times the people have fought bitter military and legislative battles to preserve these freedoms.

Physical education has responded by realizing that without choice there can be little freedom. To be free to choose requires a knowledge and experience of things to choose from. And as J. B. Nash says:

> In order to choose, a man must be able to distinguish between good, better, and best or that which is helpful as against that which is hurtful, and must have had a wide play and recreational experience gathered from such fields as art, crafts, nature exploration, music, drama, literature, and sports and games. There is but a narrow range of choice if his diet has consisted of little but the radio, television and movie thrillers where he sits on the side lines and does not participate.[6]

This is a compelling reason why a physical education program must be broad rather than narrow, varied rather than monotonous. The student consumer is entitled to sufficient experience to give the base for choice. There is no *one* sport, no one game, no one activity which is good for everyone. One cannot enjoy freedom if one is not free to choose from among many.

These are but seven examples of social tenets which lie at the root of a modern program. There are many others.

Physical education, as a part of the general educational pattern in America, enjoys local autonomy. There is no national program. There is no federal Ministry of Education which prescribes the kind of physical education that shall be taught in our communities. This local autonomy is a principle derived from the original colonial conception of states' rights. It was provided in the Constitution that the several states shall provide their own educational program without interference or direction from the federal government. The principle has remained intact for over a century, and states have successfully resisted, through the Congress, any effort to vest the control of education in the central government. States have developed their own programs, established their own minimum standards, financed their own schools.

To physical education such a principle means that, above the minimum limits established by his state, every physical education teacher has the responsibility of developing his own program subject only to the direction and approval of the local school officials. A teacher thus must have initiative, resourcefulness, and ability to create and administer. The responsibility and authority are largely local. No one will tell him what to do. He may pick and choose. It becomes essential, therefore, that he be a competent student of his field, able to weigh values, to study needs, and to meet needs with an appropriate program.

Occasionally, the complexion of local politics affects physical education. Changes in party government, emphases in economy, social attitudes, variations in the interpretation of the so-called welfare state, will modify its programs in some places. The teacher will be familiar with such local conditions and will build a program in accordance with the strength of the local wishes. No principle is involved particularly except perhaps that of expediency, which frequently affects adversely a strong adherence to more fundamental social and political points of view.

Principles arise from an analysis of the working conditions under which the population lives. If leisure is on the increase, physical education moves to meet the need for its constructive use. Physical education tries to equip its students with worthwhile and interesting activities that can contribute to the enjoyment of leisure. If technology lessens the need for manual labor, physical education responds by developing vigorous sports and other activities in its program and by teaching its students the necessity of compensating for the inactivity forced upon them by the industrialized society.

If the labor movement seeks certain advantages to union members through recreation at the plant or in the community, physical education attempts to teach the young how best to enjoy the facilities once they become eligible for them.

It is patently not enough that man's society be analyzed to discover something about physical education. Man's nature must be looked at also. The facts of his unity, of his growth and development, of the way he reacts and learns—these are basic. If one were to assay the relative importance of the two sets of facts, i.e., from his society and from his nature, one would recognize the stalemate argument between heredity and environment. Man cannot achieve anything socially unless his original nature permits him to. The genetic strain is a limiting factor. It sets upper limits. The quality of tissue which composes any given individual determines his maximum achievement. Education cannot prepare for any form of society unless the organic and psychological potentialities are there which will make for its attainment.

Thus physical education must know man and be guided by his nature. It will be worthwhile to review briefly some of the elements to illustrate how principles grow out of the facts of man's life:

1. *The human animal is intended to be an integrated whole.* The forces of disease, worry, the sedentary life, and others may lead him toward disintegration, but basically he strives toward the harmonious functioning of all his powers each in relation to the other and all in relation to the whole. Physical education responds to this by teaching activities which occupy the whole of man, rather than those which segment him. Totally developmental activities are preferred to those which deal only with muscle or with body areas.

2. *The increase in size and height, the growth of the vital systems, can be studied and the predicted rates and states known at any given time in a child's life.* Measures of growth are available. Some things are possible at certain growth stages which are not possible at others.

Physical education responds by adapting its program to those growth stages. It hopes not to ask too much of its students, nor does it want to lag behind with activities insufficiently stimulating for the growth needs.

3. *Muscular development is indispensable to the welfare of the total organism.* Physical education responds by developing the principle of central muscular involvement (as opposed to peripheral), of large muscle activity. The program then emphasizes free-swinging, free-moving games and dances which must of necessity be developmental in the abdominal area.

4. *Boys and girls differ in their physiology, their rates of maturation, their anatomy.* Physical education applies what it knows not only of individual differences but of the differences between the sexes and produces two similar but nevertheless different programs. The practice is geared to the principle of difference which is derived from the facts.

5. *The organism is expendable.* Tissue gives out. It may be attacked and destroyed. Conversely, it heals. It repairs itself. Physical education knows of these processes and tries only to facilitate, never to interfere; only to develop, never to tear down. Knowing disease processes, the intelligent teacher would never ask for participation during disease. Knowing metabolism, the teacher would give ample time for repair of fatigue.

6. *Individuals vary from one another and within themselves from time to time in heart size and power.* The heart can be damaged. Conditions should be favorable for its growth. Activity can antagonize the heart when it has been previously damaged. The program must be adjusted individually to compensate for heart variations.

7. *The new interpretations of perception have an obvious bearing upon learning motor skills.* Teaching must be done in the light of the facts. The mark of the antiquarian is his failure to use such newer knowledge when it can be applied.

8. *Man can learn best when he learns all over.* The sense of motion, of knowing where one is in space, of feeling muscularly the thing being experienced, is basic to all animal life. The physical education teacher studies these relationships and knows that an intellectual appreciation of a sport is a poor imitation at best of the real understanding of it which can only be gained by taking part in it. That is why he prefers activity to discussion, participation to watching. He also understands how possible it is to learn more of art, for example, by painting or drawing, more of literature by trying to write, more of games by playing them. The program deals with this sort of learning. It is total learning.

9. *A study of the nervous system indicates how important it is to the vital systems to have consciousness diverted from them*. Physical education responds by developing a program which endeavors to fix attention on an objective rather than upon form, to aid in substituting an object-consciousness for a self-consciousness. The program seeks to avoid the self-adulation of some activities and substitute a selflessness more likely to be derived from others.

10. *Common causes of disintegration of the personality are known*. The program of physical education seeks to substitute status and security for frustration and rejection. It seeks to control the play situation so that it can be sure of the relation of the participant to others within it. The program is concerned about those who participate. The outcomes in personal development are significantly more important than those on the scoreboard or on the balance sheet.

There are scores of other such elements from analyses of the nature of man's make-up. The way one learns, the role played by interest, the desirability of accurately appraising oneself, the facts about muscle warm-up, of digestion—these and other elements are all of sufficient importance to modify a program of physical education.

And thus, physical education analyzes the cut of man's culture, his society, his nature, the conditions under which he lives. The teacher realizes that he must answer these needs, must contribute to appreciation of fine living, of beauty, of happiness. The program will die unless it bears a recognizable identity not only to the deeper purposes and directions of man's society but also to nature and to his basic capacities.

Principles of physical education are thus derived from the way people want to live—and programs which express these principles affect the continuation or alteration of these social patterns.

NOTES

1. John Dewey, *My Pedagogic Creed* (Washington, DC: National Education Association), p. 6.
2. Ibid.
3. Educational Policies Commission, *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1938), p. 17.
4. Ibid.
5. John Dewey.
6. Jay B. Nash, *Philosophy of Recreation and Leisure* (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co., 1953), p. 37.

A Decalogue of Principles

John Dewey once said that no program of education could survive in a democracy except that it draws its life from the people. There is no merit in advocating any program or point of view unless it stems from the discernible facts of man's life or his society. The empirical, preconceived, and biased notions of one who argues without his facts Dewey relegates to the mumbo-jumbo of superstition and rationalization. To advocate something because it is old, or has been used before, or merely on the say-so of the pundit is a form of influence hardly fitting in our educational planning of today.

In physical education there have turned up some notable instances of violations of Dewey's premise. We generally give what meager credit is due, for example, to Jahn, one of the early 19th century fascists of Europe, for using physical education most effectively as a device for the creation of a nationalism that was neither based on the facts of man's organic function nor in keeping with the best of his social and psychological possibilities. How successful he was can only be judged in our time by the repeated wars we have had with the products of his ideology.

Other such usurpers of the rights of people have come and gone. Most of

---

Delivered on the occasion of the retirement of Blanche M. Trilling as director of physical education for women at the University of Wisconsin, May 1946. Published in *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 18:4-5, 50-54; January 1947.

them have gone, although contemporary physical education, like contemporary education, shows the marks of their abuses. Today's struggle to determine what shall be the nature of a modern education is unfortunately as much an effort to throw off the old influences as it is to create something new and more closely fitting the American scene.

Today's professional group of teachers are the beneficiaries of hard, patient, and productive work on the part of those who have lived in this half century. As a result of this work we have seen an American program of physical education evolve to the point where we can see its outlines. We can recognize its shape through the fog of tradition. What we are doing today in physical education is the outcome, the product of this analysis of American life by those who have forced us all to look at American people as our only source of what is good in our educational institutions.

In the first half of this century we resisted many varied attempts to capture physical education and make of it something which would have died in the last half. Many have been the flamboyant schemes to perpetrate a national physical culture bereft of anything but physical outcomes. We might have been overwhelmed with an athletic aristocracy which honored only the perfect performance of the highly skilled—and all male, at that. We haven't much of that today. When impressive Nils Bukh came over and taught Danish gymnastics many rushed to imitate. We might have modeled our programs after many another off-shore influence because there have been dozens of them trying to capture our imagination. We have been urged to take up jai-lai and marching, red drills and white, high bars and low bars, free hand and heavy, this system and that, and we have received them all, forgotten most, and moved on seeking only the activity, the method, and the outcome which must, as Dewey foretold, jibe with the things we as a people are and want to be.

But now we are emerging from our formative years. The early work of the great men and women of our field was passed on to strong minds and sure hands. It is timely to say that we are at last growing up, still somewhat adolescent in thought and practice, to be sure; but the writer feels that our professional fiascos of this last great war, born out of our immaturity, are among our last, and that henceforward we will mature to the point where we will know what physical education in American schools is—should be and can be.

For with us, as with all other professions, principle has been slow to evolve but once established has dominated practice. Our principles have been a century in the making. The discovery of the facts of man's organic life, of his psychological behaviors, and of his social nature has been a slow and continuing process, basic to the establishment of principles. The revelations of the facts of man's life, the formulation of principles based upon them, the establishment of objectives as outgrowths of principles and the development of practice to attain the objectives—that has been our pattern of growth. All other patterns have died of their own unsoundness.

These principles then have set the stage for the future of physical education in our land. May we phrase a decalogue of them and cite them one by one as characteristic of American physicial education today?

> FIRST: That American physical education must be in the image of the American democracy, must be rooted in the culture of American people, and must have no values different from those conducive to life in the republic.

We no longer can tolerate a physical education for the few. We cannot rest until there is to be seen in every program in the country an equality of opportunity for all, for girls as well as boys, for the skilled as well as the dub, for the handicapped as well as the normal, each to seek and find his appropriate physical education. For rich and poor, and for all races and creeds we must follow the great beliefs of all education and bring to everyone the facilities, time, and instruction to participate in the great heritage of dance and sport, games and athletics. People everywhere, on the farm and in the factory, in the cities and in rural areas, must feel the impact of our work.

> SECOND: That the practice of physical education must forever acknowledge the known and proven fact about the human organism.

We have resisted quackery before and we must continue to do so. The false claims for exercise, the spurious training processes, the legend of deep breathing exercises, the misplaced emphases upon muscle development, and the panaceas for health—these and others fade away under the bright light of fact. In their place has come a rational program of developmental activity, suited to age and sex, to condition and need, and taught well by people who know the possibilities and limitations of human life.

> THIRD: That in all of physical education there is but one set of purposes, one standard of values, and one criterion for measuring the worth of practice—the good of the individual.

No other standard is acceptable in democratic education. We sacrifice the individual, exploit him, use him as a means rather than as an end only in time of war. In peace his right to development, to self-expression, to self-direction, and his responsibility for self-control are paramount. We can sacrifice no player for the sake of the team or for the glory of the coach. Glory in victory must be enjoyed to the fullest only if it is earned not at the expense of the individual.

We cannot use commercial value, or expediency, or selfish purpose as criteria to judge the worth of an activity or of the relation of an individual to it. We must put in first place the welfare of the American girl and boy and accept no values but those which reflect their best interests.

> FOURTH: That physical education contains within it a great potential for learning, for the cultivation of reflective thinking, and for the intellectualization of our choices.

There are some who say there is no thinking in physical education. They believe it is "entirely physical," that no thought is needed. Others say that our form of education is really training, the establishment of fixed habit. And so at one time it might have been. There is little of problem solving, of the search for experimental application of suggested answers, and the recognition of consequences in the learning of the pirouette or the giant swing. Little intellectualizing goes on in marching and calisthenics. Such are reflexive stunts rather than reflective acts. So also is the training given in many high-pressure sports of today. The coach does all the thinking, solves all the problems, and requires a performance quite within the category of a fixed habit. But actually a physical education means teaching the skills and behaviors within activities so as to allow for student participation in the planning, in the decision. It requires the anticipation of situations involving choice and the hope for the development of a flexible habit that gives the learner the means of solving the problems as he meets them in his constantly changing world. Opportunities are unlimited in physical education for learning and for reflective thinking. The richness to be derived from teaching in physical education is not in the sheer fact of performance but in the quality of the thinking that produced the performance, either good or bad.

> FIFTH: That the teaching of values on the ethical-moral plane must assuredly be as definite and planned for as those of skill.

We deal with individuals. As adults, we begin teaching individuals when they are infants. The first things taught are individual behavior patterns. Eventually, we want courage, unselfishness, and a fine sense of honor. No child can grasp any such abstractions except that he form them from a constellation of specific acts or behaviors. Learning to be a "good sport" begins when he walked away from the swing in a huff because someone else got there first. Learning about cooperation might well have begun on the ball diamond when he learned "not to be a pig about his turn at bat." We need to reduce the learning about this code of ethics of ours, these complicated moral values, to teachable elements. We need to isolate them, see them, teach them, and evaluate their development as surely as we measure speed in swimming or the length of a jump. Physical education cannot dodge its responsibility for the cultivation of its rich potentialities in this area of personal conduct.

> SIXTH: That physical education is as much a social science as a biological one because its outcomes are measurable in terms of group behaviors as well as organic enrichment.

In a democracy we learn to operate in groups. We express ourselves, test our expression against that of others, then go along if necessary with the opposition for the good of the whole. We were not born with such talent. We have to learn it. In physical education we know all about such group action. The team, the club, the room, the class—those are the units with which we work. To learn how to help in the adjustment of the individual to the cross-currents of other personalities within the group is one of our privileges. We must develop the social competencies within our students. Students can be taught within the group that greatest of all lessons within a democracy—respect for personality. They can be helped to avoid the unsocial behaviors of selfishness or bigotry, and we can claim distinction in this field only when we know as much about how to assure a social acceptance as we now know how to teach the forehand drive. Physical fitness is not enough, nor are coordination and skill. These three must not be allowed to monopolize our efforts as we strive for outcomes. Physical education is irrevocably a multiple-outcome experience, and our methods must be so devised as to secure them.

SEVENTH: That the activities and methods producing an objective extroverted flow of consciousness are more to be desired than those which turn the individual upon himself toward an introverted development.

This principle, based as it is upon the well-known facts of the psychosomatic relationships, sounds the death knell for body-building, body-worship, and self-adulation. It explains the unhappy fate of weight-lifting, the ballet, and too much form in anything. It explains why golf to many is such a confusing mass of frustrations in which the player, desperately striving to remember his knee, elbow, and chin, flukes his shot through self-consciousness as surely as the speaker complains of gastric butterflies when he worries more about the impression he will make than about what he has to say. The exhibitionist, the poseur, may be products of this method, and our selections of activities and our methods of teaching can avoid these outcomes frequently by directing the flow of consciousness outward—on the ball, the mountain, the choreography, or the welfare of the opponent. We in physical education have a responsibility, shared with other influences, to be sure, for producing the more productive, socially useful personality.

EIGHTH: That physical education, far from being an isolated and quite foreign element within the curriculum of American education contains within it elements quite identical with the other expressive arts.

It is no accident that physical education has historically and now cultivated a lively correlation with music and art, drama and literature. No singular offshoot is our solid development of dance in all its forms as a means of human expression. These relationships are to be expected. Anything else would be foreign to the way people have always lived. The ceremony and festival, the pageant and party have always and do now call for a natural and inevitable relationship of movement to all the others. We can well forget entirely, if we ever entertained the idea, that a physical education involves only games and athletics, and that all else is completely incomprehensible.

> NINTH: That physical education stands upon its own feet as a profession, solidly within the scientific and social culture of the race, beholden to no other group, but ready to work cooperatively with other professions for human betterment.

The old inferiority complex we used to have is fading away. We are more sure now of our contribution. Soon it will be that those educators who do not see the values inherent in a physical education will themselves have lost their intellectual integrity. The process of human development cannot remain forever obscured by the dust of academic tradition. Our profession is soundly established. We have within our own ranks people of great intellectual strength and from other professions we have been assisted by great and significant revelations concerning the social and organic importance of the kind of education with which we deal. Once we lived in the backyard of education under the shadow of medicine. We do so no longer. Our contribution to human development is sufficiently in the open now to allow us to say with a modest assurance that we can and do make, not supplementary additions to growth and development, but unique and original ones.

> TENTH: That the high quality of leadership is the primary desideratum of this as of other professions, and that the American university must keep its standards high and its efforts unremitting for the selection and preparation of intelligent, well equipped, and cultured women and men teachers of physical education.

We need leaders. All of education needs leaders. Where education has failed to meet national crises it has failed in leadership. Where physical education sometimes goes awry and runs madly down some dead-end streets it does so because its leadership takes it there. Teachers everywhere must be taught to think, to discriminate, to evaluate, to teach. Certainly in physical education we have had enough of those who remain in the rut of tradition.

Nor need American universities apologize for their existing curriculums in physical and health education. They are strangely constructed in some places, that is true, and the academic eyebrow raises sometimes when we abuse the privilege of giving academic credit by awarding it to mastery which involved no intellectualizing. But by and large our curriculums are stable and reputable. We know in general how to build them, and as the years go on the physical education teacher graduating from one of our universities will measure up perfectly with the professional bachelor in other fields.

Thus the decalogue of principles is completed. It is the fulfillment of the first cycle of growth, the heritage which our predecessors have left us. These are the directions physical education is now taking.

Wherein Lies Significance?

Wherein lies significance? We have been searching for it for many years. Memory has its disadvantages. I find it extremely rewarding to have been a participant in the development of physical education during this last half century—during the years from 1920 to 1970—a half century of search for significance!

We are in 1971 now, but our mission is not yet accomplished. We have not yet found all the significance that I am sure rests within the field. As I look back on those 50 years in physical education, I can report that it has been a struggle—a fascinating struggle— to explore, to uncover, to look and to see, and to find out what there is within this field that entrances us all.

I can think in my 50 years of Amy Morris Homans of Wellesley, of J. Anna Norris of Minnesota and Gertrude Moulton of Oberlin, of Ethel Perrin of Detroit (one of the most remarkable women we ever had in our field—little bit of a thing who ran the whole city of Detroit's program by herself), of Laurentine Collins and Mabel Lee. Remember Gertrude Colby and Mary O'Donnell of Columbia? Katharine Hersey and Lydia Clark of Ohio State? Blanche Trilling and Mary Channing Coleman? Great names. Helen McKinstry of the YWCA, Margaret McKee of Missouri, Alfrieda Mosscrop, Ethel Saxman,

---

Delivered to the Association of Physical Education for College Women at the annual meeting of the Southern District of AAHPER at Oklahoma City, February 25, 1971.

Marge D'Houbler, among many others, some still around, some passed on to their reward. But it was a rare privilege to struggle with those valiant souls to find significance, to create upon the unstable foundation which was ours—the unstable foundation of essentially German and Swedish and Danish and English heritage, to find an American program suited to our people, our society, and our purposes.

As I think of those names I have a feeling always of the great and courageous efforts they were making, as our predecessors, to create, evolve, and develop a program to fit the needs of our people, particularly the youth in our society. We were not always successful. That is to say, we are not capable yet of saying that this is our program for our people. It is difficult in a pluralistic society. So all I intend to do is suggest three or four sources of significance.

First, it is of consummate significance that we persist in our efforts to develop programs that reflect the social, the political, and the educational goals of our people and that have no value in variance from those goals. How difficult it is to create a program in the image of our democratic society—partly because we have had a hard time defining our democratic society, partly because by its very nature it is an elusive quality (much more so than some of the other political systems the world has known in the last century), partly because you and I, if we were to make an honest confession, would probably say we have not at all times done our homework. We have not read Jefferson, Madison, Henry Adams and Lincoln and John Dewey, Jane Addams and Horace Mann, Woodrow Wilson and Jack Kennedy, and probably not even Leiberman or Norman Cousins, great persons who have woven part of the backdrop of American education. They have struggled to help us create programs of American education that reflect the best of this great idea which broke upon our shores 300 years ago.

I suggest that those people I have mentioned are so important in physical education that you and I cannot possibly find significance until we have read them. It is easier not to read. Our field is such a happy field that it is easier not to do our homework. It is much easier to go over to England, find something that is working over there, and bring it over here. It is much easier to do some research on American Indian dances and put them in the junior high school, to introduce yoga or karate or judo, to resurrect the formalism of the Swedish gymnastics programs or to bring over Danish. It is much easier to find some gimmick, some novelty, something esoteric, something slightly offbeat out of which we can make a cult than to do our homework and try to figure out what it is that the world of education can contribute to the preservation of the particular society, to figure out what our goals are as a people of 200 million Americans, and *then* build a program to match it.

Is there a structured character to the society in which we live? Sure there is. Our legal structure is one. Based upon Blackstone, it carries the tradition of our legal system, our courts; our whole process of legalism is based upon clear principles. Our world derives from those principles and includes authority figures from the family to the teacher to the police. In our own field, we have our rules and our officials, our umpires, our referees. It is sad, therefore, when you see us failing to encourage adherence to authority, to the basic structure upon which our legalistic system is based. We are significant, after all. Children learn about authority on our basketball floors and our hockey fields. They should come to respect the word of the official as the authority figure. The official is the governor, the judge, the magistrate that ramifies through our society.

Thus, when one reads of the activity of some of our organizations that seem to be ignoring this basic element of structure in our society, one is saddened. When one reads, for example, of the activities of the NCAA and their system of penalties for violators of the law, one wonders! Many colleges, particularly through their men's athletic programs, get themselves in trouble because of violations of certain rules, and those colleges, of which mine was one several years ago, are penalized. They have to remain out; their teams may not share in television royalties or participate in a bowl game or a championship contest sponsored by the NCAA, because they are in violation of a certain rule. The penalties are inflicted upon the institution, not upon the offender. Our whole legal structure is based upon the idea that the offender is the one who is brought to court and penalized if found guilty. But if Oklahoma or Ohio State is penalized by the NCAA, the whole system is set down for a year or so—every team and every player. When we were set down about seven years ago because of certain infractions of NCAA regulations on the part of our coaches of *one* sport, *all* players in *all* sports were affected, and thus our world-champion diver could not go to the championships, and the tennis team could not go to their tournament, and the basketball team could not go to theirs because of the offense committed by someone else! It is as if you offended and I was penalized, which is in complete violation of the basic structure of our legal system.

It is difficult when one sees the shady cheating, the violent disruption of college games, the showboating of coaches as they encourage players to violate the laws. The difference between throwing a seat cushion and a rock is not very great. If we are willing to condone throwing seat cushions, it is just a small step to throwing rocks. If those of us who have lived through tumultuous times cannot teach our children in the physical education classes to protect our legally established cultural patterns, we have missed an opportunity to find the potential significance of our field. If we cannot teach our children to accept the consequences of their acts, if we cannot teach our players to accept the role of officials, we are not finding a significant relationship between us and the goals our society seeks. This is one of the reasons I have always thought that behavior is just as important, if not more so, than skill.

It is significant that students understand purpose in all of their educational experience. Today there is a rather healthy revival of John Dewey, and having been a student of John Dewey many years ago on Morningside Heights, I remember his constant pleas to the educators of his time to understand, to explain, to illuminate purpose. Why, said he constantly to us, what is the purpose of this? What is the purpose of the Cotton Bowl, the Rose Bowl, a hockey game, a swimming meet, a volleyball contest? What is the purpose of algebra and of English history and of geometry? He has always, in his writings belabored the impotence, the futility of teaching in the classical tradition of Latin and algebra and requiring them for all without a single explanation of why.

The most significant and important question that can be asked in all of education is "why"? That is why I so much enjoyed an experience I had some years ago on the advisory committee of a Job Corps installation in New Bedford, Mass., run by Bill Saltonstall, the cousin of the famous senator, Everett Saltonstall. Saltonstall had come out of Exeter after 20 years of dealing with "the upper classes." In the Job Corps, he ran a beautiful school for 480 dropouts—men and boys, 16 to 18 years old, that our system of education had missed completely. They had dropped out because, as one of them said to me, "I didn't care particularly about the names of the English queens. I wasn't too terribly excited about algebra." "How did you feel about physical education?" said I. He said, "I hated the stuff." He didn't know I was a physical education teacher, so I pursued the matter. "Why didn't you like it?" He said, "I have never known a meaner man or a more sadistic creature than my gym teacher." He meant the authoritarian demon who ordered them, marched them, countermarched them, punished these lads in physical education. I said, "What do you want to get from the Job Corps?" He wanted to become a data processor. "What do you want to do if you can't become a data processor?" And he said, "I want to become a physical education teacher." Amazing switch. I said, "Why?" He said, "Because I realize that in that field there were potentials, there was an opportunity to deal with the kind of a guy I am—a dropout." He was black and he was a victim and a refugee of the great riots in Buffalo. But he said, "I can see, I did see, and I hope to have chance to bring to life the meaning and the purpose of what physical education can establish." Needless to say, we had quite a conversation about that!

Purpose is important. What is the purpose of karate, ballet, judo, boxing, yoga, basketball? We must find purpose in things we do, and our purposes must reflect accurately the basic social and political purposes of our American society.

The second source of significance is one with which I have bored you many times before, but I must mention it because we have suffered long enough from the popular misconception that physical education is strictly a physical thing, that we do not deal with people but with protoplasm. Therefore, we seek to achieve nothing but strength and other physical values. Hence, we bring back mass exercise and physical training, and we do not know the difference between physical training and physical education. In my estimation, this is blinding. It has been my observation that not more than 20 percent of our people around the country seek any other values than those emphasized by the adjective "physical." Maybe a little leisure creeps in now and then, or someone talks about movement, but for the most part, we still think of ourselves pridefully as purveyors of physical fitness. We have to remake this concept before we find our significant potential.

We have to recognize that physical education experience is distinctly a personal thing not measured by protoplasmic quantity, not measured by heartbeat or the EKG or the Kreb's cycle or the fitness scores. *These are nothing more than means* by which we can get some purchase on the total evaluation of the experience that a girl or boy has with us in our program. We have an obligation to the student. Our principal task is to deal with her as a total human being. We need to help her look inside herself to examine her own thoughts and feelings, to help her to confront and not evade her own anxiety and loneliness, to treasure the idea, the hope, the development—not just the care and feeding of an individual. The experience in physical education can produce acceptance rather than rejection, success rather than frustration, self-actualization rather than disintegration, fun and pleasure rather than debilitating tensions, recognitions of reality over fantasy, the development of self-respect rather than self-negation. *These* are the big ends for physical education, the big words—success, acceptance, self-actualization, self-direction, self-respect.

Why the student unrest of the 1960s and spirited 70s? There have been many versions around the country. I think, and I agree with Norman Cousins and other writers, that certainly this generation of students wants to play a part in determining their own education. Why must I take algebra? Why is physical education required? Why? Unless we come up with the answers, we're gone, we're sunk. The answers in our field are perfectly clear: rich, exciting experience for most people. I agree fully with René DuBos, who emphasizes that life in America can become enriched only to the extent that we measure its quality and not its quantity. We do not care about our fleet or our Gross National Product or the number of federal employees we have or any other statistic, but the concern has to be centered upon the quality of the lives of the people, all 200 million of us. Thus, the only reason in terms of this element of significance for our existence is the contribution we can make to the emerging personality of the developing girl and not to the Kreb's cycle and not to the fitness test.

Wherein lies significance? May I suggest a third source? I think the significance of our field can be found as long as we keep in mind that physical education is a whole thing. We must never allow ourselves to segment it, divide it into its parts and thus allow the parts to obscure, to dominate, to usurp, and to blind us to the wholeness of the experience and the profession. I am frightened with what has happened to medicine with the development of the specialist—the otorhinolaryngologist, the psychiatrist, the neuropsychiatrist, the internist—a whole field of 14 or 18 or 22 specialists. If we do this sort of thing in physical education—develop specialists in gymnastics, dance, motor learning, and exercise physiology and forget that the field is a whole field employing a wide variety of different activities to produce the kind of results in the development of human personality that we're after—then I do not think we will ever be able to find significance.

I am very much concerned about dance today. Dance seems to be moving away from its origins in physical education to the performing arts. What is a performing art? Is football a performing art? Is basketball? Golf? Tennis? Why does dance have the character of the performing arts? Dancers are performers, and is what they do an art? I dare say it is both, but is it not physical education? Is it not part of the education of the individual? Does it not contribute to the total person? Are teachers of dance today more interested in the movement than the movers? I know what dance is, but I hate to see the field going Broadway. I saw Villella the other night and Nureyev a month or two ago; they are magnificent dancers. But what kind of people have they become *because* they are dancers? That is the crucial question. To fragment the field to the point where we fail to have a common purpose or to understand each other would be the greatest mistake we could make.

In closing, let me suggest that we will find significance when we realize that our "discipline"—if there is such a thing—will be found not in such artificial subject matter demarcations as physiology or movement or skills or chemistry or even philosophy, but in the revelation of our contribution to the science of human experience. Therein lies significance. We must pursue this exploration to find those elements indigenous to our movement experience that make the contribution to the human being developing in our evolving but nevertheless broadly structured society.

To find this, I believe, was what our forebears tried to get us to do. I am hoping that the search of those women I mentioned at the beginning will not be abandoned or forgotten as we grow in number and size and importance and dignity. Significance lies in our contribution to the totality of human experience as we seek to live in a society directed toward clear goals of which the enrichment of human personality is the essential element.

An Armenian from Des Moines

My principal credential for occupying this spot of privilege is that I knew the man, Holger F. Kilander, whose memory we celebrate today. We were friends of long and pleasant standing. We shared accommodations at at least two professional meetings, and when it came time to recognize him with the presentation of the Howe Award from the American School Health Association, the committee asked me to prepare and read a citation. In it I said, "A prominent contemporary churchman described a liberally educated person as one who has a clear, conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, seeks the truth in developing them, is eloquent in expressing these judgments, and is forceful in arguing them." Holger F. Kilander qualifies fully. Kellie was motivated by an indomitable will to serve. Rarely has our profession contained a man who exemplifies with such absolute clarity the happy combination of altruism, sharp intellect, and an infinite capacity to be useful. Here was truly a professional cosmopolite. His record was fantastically broad. He was a writer of distinction. He was a stimulating professor in health education. His research effort is renowned. He was a sportsman, world traveler, raconteur, and administrator.

My fervent hope, at this moment, is that these remarks of mine will do justice to Dr. Kilander, whom you have chosen to honor by dedicating this meeting.

The Holger F. Kilander Memorial Lecture delivered at the annual meeting of the Eastern District of AAHPER, New York, March 16, 1974.

The title of this presentation would suggest that I knew a gentleman from Des Moines. Indeed, I did. I remember him well. I had an unplanned luncheon with him at the hotel just before a 2 o'clock meeting with the Iowa Physical Education Association. The hotel was crowded with teachers, and teachers were not in very good repute at that time because of the attacks made upon us by such dubious authorities as Admiral Rickover, John Hersey, Clifton Fadiman, and others. They were contending that American education was of a low order and that something drastic should be done about it. My companion at the table, after he had ascertained that I was a teacher, made a rather startling remark: "You teachers are the most important people in the world." Gratified by this, I suggested that he explain why he thought so. He replied that it was his belief that it was on the shoulders of teachers that the preservation of this democratic society rested. He insisted that to maintain our freedom as free persons in a free society, the principal task of teachers was to convey to the oncoming generation the full meaning of these concepts. He had seen *his* country destroyed by the invaders. Their freedoms were lost, families destroyed; the whole fabric of their society had been disintegrated by the oppressor. He wanted desperately to prevent that from happening here, and he placed us teachers in the front line of defense against it. He was an Armenian, and Armenia had been destroyed by the Turks in 1915-16.

I have thought a great deal about what he had in mind, particularly what it meant to us in physical education, health education, and recreation. Is there something within the scope of these three fields that will accomplish his purpose? Does the field of recreation, as we know it, have a bearing upon preserving our free society? May the same thing be said about health education or physical education? What *did* he mean? My table companion indirectly challenged us to examine our contribution to free persons living in a free society.

Where do we begin? We are three fields. Are we separate in our character and influence, or are we related? I believe that we are quite obviously related in that we spring from a common element of concern with and influence upon the qualitative aspects of human experience as it relates to the *whole* person. Probably the only reason we exist is to be judged by the contribution we make to the emerging personality of the human being—to the integrated self, reaching beyond the commonly recognized boundaries of the mental, physical, and emotional levels of consciousness not yet easily recognized in Western civilization. This sort of thing is described, perhaps, as a transpersonal self involving wholeness not readily acknowledged by those not prepared to think beyond the familiar dichotomy of mind and body. Whatever our eventual concept of wholeness may become, my contention is that the three fields will find their similarities in their essential contributions to it.

We will, and do, make that contribution through a process—the process of education—by which humans come into increasing possession of themselves and their powers through increasing and continously expanding participation in the achievement of the race, while they evaluate and re-evaluate this achievement as they gain control of the methods of using it.

Once we grasp the nature and purpose of this process as it fosters the development of humans in their holistic state, I believe we can make a strong claim to a potential and important contribution to the perpetuation of a free society for free persons. But such contribution will not come automatically just because we say it is there. We have to work at it. We have to educate people to want to preserve their freedom, then to construct and reconstruct their society so that it *is* preserved. The key is *education* and its bearing upon the *whole* person.

For example, I have often wondered why so many of our people, particularly in physical education, shy away from such effort and are content to tell the world that we are so terribly "physical." It is not too difficult to become physical. The Turks who destroyed Armenia were very physical in their invasion, as were the Nazis when they took the Low Countries, as were the Nigerians in their destruction of the Biafrans, as were the sheriffs and their dogs at Selma and the police in Chicago. Strength is strength wherever you find it, and if its production is the only mission in life of a physical educator to the exclusion of the *purposes* to which strength is put, then we have a very easy task indeed.

But my Armenian companion was talking about something else. He was talking abut the preservation of freedom, about teaching people how to live together as free persons in this free society. To us in physical education the implication is clear: *What* is our purpose, the overriding purpose of our existence? Is it strength? I doubt it.

In preparation for our meeting this afternoon, I have been brushing up on some current writing in physical education. I was hunting for some evidence that physical educators are currently exploring their contribution to the society that sustains them. I chose to examine the last three issues of *Quest*, thus sampling the writing of that group of intellectuals who write for the college associations. I did not find much because, as one writer put it, most institutions offering the doctorate in physical education encourage their candidates to specialize in such subdisciplines as exercise physiology, sport psychology, motor learning, or sports sociology. That latter subspecialty might have some promise, but I could not find much beyond Ellis and Hubbard on human and mechanical factors in ergometry, a paper on the deception paradigm and debriefing, and Renshaw on the nature of human movement studies. I found a paper on the taxonomy of research, Studer on moving man to moving man—but with no hint that it might be important to study the purpose of movement. In the most recent issue, of those I perused, Podeschi wrote a promising piece on the further reaches of physical activity, and Roberta Park entices us to believe that there are alternatives of nonactivity that might be used in the future. There were stories on chronobiology, holography, trend extrapolation. So it was pleasant to read Ann Jewett prognosticating the future, telling us that physical education will focus on each person, will be seen as a continuing educational process with voluntary participation, and stronger and more creative leadership will predominate—just as Williams and Nash and Wood and Perrin and Hetherington used to tell us 50 years ago.

We will have to put up with many diversions and excursions into research esoterica before we strike pay dirt in the form of an implementation of our programs as an effective tool for the perpetuation of the free democratic way—whatever the future holds that to be.

Overall, the review of recent literature was reasonably reassuring. If it is safe to make any judgment on the basis of the contents of that one bi-annual publication, *Quest,* we are gaining. We are getting there. Monographs put out by those college associations contain more material germane to the challenge I have been describing.

But I found one scholar in the field saying that he "rarely ever uses the term *physical education* anymore"—he substitutes *sports medicine*. I can only conclude that he does not know the meaning of the word *education* and equates *medicine* with it. I understand those in dance find it more comfortable to think in terms of the "performing arts" than to evaluate the rewards in personal development that come from the educational experience of being creative in the world of dance. Dance as a performing art can be equated rather easily with skill on the high wire, the balance beam, the high hurdles, or the "front four." The human element of total growth—intellectual, social, moral, *total* growth—is ignored for performance only of the athlete, the dancer, or the elephant on his box. That is all that counts if we conceive of our activities solely in terms of performing arts.

I read about the mysteries of motor learning, of kinesthetics, of operant conditioning, exercise physiology, and performance-based teacher education. In fact, unless I am mistaken, there are some college departments so anxious to become accepted by the averred "intellectuals" of the campus that they have declared their emancipation from the lowbrow term of *physical education* and have become something else sounding strangely like good old *kinesiology*—the study of the origin, insertion, and action of muscles!

What nonsense! What shallow and irresponsible thinking to discard the term *education* for such mechanistic or biological terms related only to muscle action and how to direct it!

What *are* the goals of physical education in this day and age? Strength? Physical fitness? Skill? We won't quarrel with those as long as no one says they are the principal or ultimate goal. They are not. Anyone can be strong and brainless. Anyone can be physically fit and have the conscience of a murderer. Anyone can win the Heisman Trophy and have the social skills of a slob. Strength, skill, and fitness are not enough to have in this republic based upon a free society of free persons.

It becomes of consummate importance that we build programs of physical education that reflect the social, political, and cultural character of our society and have no goals at variance from that character. It is important to realize that physical education is a complex discipline involving such potential outcomes as self-expression, skill, systemic integrity, fun and enjoyment, acceptable behavior, understanding of self, and understanding of human interaction. From the inescapable human interaction can come an understanding of the democratic way, including as its principal ingredient respect for personality and an understanding of ethics. Of course, to obtain all of these as outcomes is a prodigious task and is so frightening to most people in physical education they back away from it and choose simpler outcomes to explore and to obtain.

But of even greater importance than the individual and potential social controls provided by the physical education potential is experience in thinking, involving as that does examination of new and promising ways to solve problems, application and evaluation of some of them, selection of successful techniques, and resumption of the ongoing activity.

The Armenian meant that free persons in a free society learn to make decisions and to accept the consequences of their decisions. Many of us have been drumming upon this for years, and only recently have we felt the impact of the American student who wants to participate in the decision-making process that affects one's education and one's destiny.

How can we intensify this in physical education? By inviting students to participate in elementary, high school, and college curriculum making; by giving them a participatory experience in determining the strategy of games, selection of their leaders, standards of dress, rule making, and choreography. I am totally unable to understand today's trend in modern dance, for example, which seems to emphasize performance rather than creative expression in choreography. Dance is getting to be just like college football; the coach does 90 percent of the thinking. If the trend continues to the point where college dance groups emulate Broadway as big-time college football cares only about bowl games and being "number one," then I can understand clearly how and why dance has lost its birthright as a physical *education* activity. This sort of thinking requires an opportunity to evaluate current practice by testing, altering the practice if it does not fit the recognized need, and then constructing new ways of doing things in terms of what has been learned.

This process of evaluating, of thinking through a problem, causes us to examine our concept of the origin of authority. Wherein lies authority in a democracy, and how do you teach people how to acknowledge and observe it? In the first place, the Greeks understood that democracy meant simply "the rule of people." We have borrowed the idea, and from Thomas Jefferson on down to Lincoln, Wilson, Stevenson, William O. Douglas, and a host of others who have written about this democratic way, we have been told that we, the people, are in command. We, the people, establish the rules by which we live. We, the people, select our leaders, our councils, Congress, and our Presidents, and we expect from them leadership in the image of our fundamental precepts in return for which we acknowledge their authority in administering our complex society.

The referee, the teacher, or the coach in our world of physical education becomes the authority figure and is deserving of our respect because he or she has been chosen by us to be our representative in conducting our interesting activities. How can anyone, then, in physical education lie, cheat, use shady practices, take the rules of the game unto himself for his own purposes to the disadvantage of his opponents? Such practice is destructive of the society in which we live. How could anyone riot, or encourage a riot, at one of our athletic contests? How could anyone cry the disrespectful "boo" without knowing that he thereby undermines the very authority we chose and agreed to live by?

And thus my lament about physical education, most sadly sung at times, seems to center on our use or misuse of the word *education*. The word must have a meaning. It surely can be better defined than merely to say that any old experience is education. I suppose any old experience *is* education. Falling in front of a subway is an experience, and it is educating. Robbing a bank is an experience, and *it* is educating, but common sense tells us that sort of thing is not what we are talking about as we try to describe the educational potential in the physical education experience. There has to be some element of quality involved, and that element has to have some relation to the social destiny of the democratic culture within which we live and to the adaptation of the individual, not only to one's own growth and development potential, but to one's relation to the acceptable and evolving social patterns of society.

We have just described education as the process by which one comes into possession of oneself and one's powers. Where better than in the dynamic laboratory of the gymnasium or the playing field, the pool, the ski run, or the dance studio can one learn of one's possibilities and limitations? Where better, indeed, to find some answers to youth's question, "who am I?"

Particularly potent is such an analysis of the relation to education of the physical education experience if we recognize that it is not sufficient that we teach the telemark or the cross-body block as motor skills or teach our young people to say "Nice game" at the end of a contest. We must go beyond that into the meaning of whatever behavior or skill is involved in terms of personal growth, and the meaning of the interplay of personality upon personality as we seek those laudable objectives of harmony, peace, and friendship among all peoples of this world. Is there anything more anachronistic, inconsistent, and downright stupid than to see an international ice hockey match purporting to adhere to the Olympic ideal of understanding between nations, in which one side seems bent upon beating out the brains of the other side by any means, fair or foul? The noun *education* in our term physical education still has meaning. It is about time we sought it out and tried to make something of it.

Is the concept of equality of opportunity important in all this? One of the first concepts and administrative practices that we need to grasp fully, if we are to have a bearing upon the perpetuation of our free and democratic society, is that we, as teachers of physical education and directors of recreation, need to develop a firm, uncompromising, and unshakable belief in the equality of opportunity for *all* people. Let us not be elementary about this. We know, of course, that not all persons are created equal, but when Horace Mann opened the American school system to all, he meant that opportunity for learning must be spread equally to *all* children so that educational programs would mirror the social status of democracy. We are only about half done with our task. There are still far too many girls and women, far too many boys and men, and far too many of the handicapped who as yet do not enjoy the fruits of the physical education experience or have access to recreational facilities.

We are talking about the 40 percent of all boys and girls who entered the first grade this year but who will drop out for one or another reason before leaving high school. The chances are their physical education experience did not mean much to them while they were there. We are talking about the 400,000 children who will be before our courts this year as delinquent, and about the tens of thousands of alienated adolescents. What are we doing on a broad scale to open the physical education experience to these people? We are talking about the 500,000 children with psychomotor handicaps and the 10 million hungry and undernourished children who will be permanently affected by the defects in our society which deny them enough opportunity for growth. We are talking about the 7 million children whose life expectancy is shortened by disease, hunger, and despair, and about the 4 percent of all babies who come into this world with birth defects and whose lives are blighted unless we, or others, can help them compensate for their handicaps. And, of course, we are thinking about the millions of others with cardiovascular and neurological deficits, pulmonary dysfunctions, orthopedic problems, or metabolic disturbances who are too frequently excused for some reason or other from experience with either physical education or health education.

Of course, we remain respectful of the talented, and we go to great lengths to provide the highly skilled with opportunity to cultivate their talent, but in virtually every school system in the land there are thousands of children who have not yet been brought within the physical education complex in a satisfying manner, if at all. There are equal numbers whose communities have not yet outlined the need for recreational programs for all. We have not yet directed our attention fully to the meaning of equality of opportunity, and thus we have not seen the emergence of the forgotten and rejected, the disparaged, impoverished, and the desperate who wish to emerge from the long dust that hides them from our view and become refreshed in the bright light of history. Theoretically, we have no closed society. We must do our part to open to the whole scope of humanity, to make sure we extend our program to all in terms of their capacity to receive it.

I am thinking, as I say these words, of that magnificent expenditure of $170 million now going on in New Orleans to provide a place for athletes in one sport or another to perform before appreciating masses, while in Roxbury, two years ago, we had to close a couple of playgrounds in some of the less favored areas of the city for want of about $5,000 to keep them going! But I always have been, and am now, of the firm belief that the physical education experience, based as it is on human movement, can be, if thoughtfully and purposefully administered, the most important force in all of education for child development and personal growth. It is up to us to make the most of it and not be diverted by objectives not related to the development of the *whole* child.

Now, let us look at health education. It has been said that to be free—free, that is, from the shackles of ignorance and fear, free to roam the unexplored, free to use discovery and innovation—humans must possess knowledge in abundance. The revelations of science and philosophy, religion and communication must be theirs in order not only to understand themselves, but to so order their world that they can survive the pressures of its population.

In health education we are intimately concerned with that point of view. We fit right into the scheme of things. Our principal contribution to the requirements of a free society is that of providing knowledge—not knowledge, as we have said over and over again, just to have knowledge, but functioning, productive, and useful knowledge that can be used in helping us to maintain our lives and foster our adjustment to a hostile and developing world. We will let others be concerned with the transmission of the culture of the ablative absolute and the War of Roses, while we become concerned about the knowledge our children may possess that will point them in line congenially with the social and ethnic problems the War of Roses generated. Can anything be more fundamental than that?

Knowledge is significant, important, and basic to survival when it is the sort of knowledge not gained by accident or by cursory attempts to teach the structure of the human animal, but knowledge that will permit a girl or a boy to know the difference between science and quackery, between fraud and exaggeration in advertising and the realizable ends in the relief of human suffering. We need to provide a basic and comforting knowledge that will enable our students to read *McCall's* or *Mademoiselle* or *Sports Illustrated* or listen to a commercial for aspirin or toothpaste and not be taken in by the extraordinary promise held out by the hucksters. Such talent requires not a superficial knowledge. It is something that cannot be transmitted once a week or on rainy days by apathetic teachers. It requires the kind of time, depth, and application now alloted to mathematics—new or old!

One cannot be free to develop one's own talent, create one's own satisfactions, preserve and cultivate one's own family life, ward off the catastrophic influences of war and pestilence and hunger, until one *knows* what to do and why and how. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse can be dispelled only through a workable, pointed, and militant knowledge.

Consider the temptations of the day and the more esoteric movements now crowding in on us through religious, commercial, and other forms of social institutions. How does one handle the implications of yoga or sensitivity training? What of value is present in transactional analysis or psychosynthesis? Has acupuncture been lying dormant for a thousand years only now to be useful in Western civilization? What about our old friends chiropractic and osteopathy or any of the modern forms of manipulative medicine? Do our students have a pretty good grasp of the nature of psychosomatic relationships insofar as they are now known?

To prepare a child to be ready to deal with the onslaught of such esoterica will require more than we are now offering—more time, more literature, more and better teachers—and we cannot go it alone. We have to have help from *all* the sciences—from biology and physiology and chemistry and the social studies. If some of our foundations interested in improving the quality of human lives wanted to do something tremendously productive in the next 10 years, they could do nothing better than to call us all together for a conference—all these now self-contained areas of study and all their basic offshoots and satellites—that would identify our principal health problems and proceed to synthesize the contribution of each area as they aid in the solution of these problems.

Why not? We have had conferences on childhood, on adolescence, and on aging, and we have had conferences relating to the various facets of school health education. Now we need to dig deeper than all of those and, instead of health education going it alone, we ought to arrange for a multidisciplinary study involving all areas that deal with human health in order to produce a picture of the depth and breadth of human needs and the available solutions to them.

We in health education have no monopoly on such effort. Neither does biology or home economics or physiology or nursing. We need a massive multimillion dollar 10-year study to identify the knowledge now available and useful, not only to us in health education but to all teachers who purport to deal with human health problems. If we want persons to be free, we have to give them the tools with which to create such freedom.

If humans are to be free, they must be emancipated from their present bondage of primitive materialism in order to release their powers of creativity and appreciation. There is absolutely no reason to believe that we know all there is to know about human perceptive or receptive powers. Researchers are continuously revealing new knowledge about the brain and the nervous system. Who is to say that new forms of consciousness will not appear, new relationships within the human's holistic nature will not force us to recast our whole present conception of physical, mental, and emotional?

This process of expanding our concept of the human is wholly within the boundaries of that provocative definition of education that says it is the process by which one comes into possession of oneself and one's powers through continuous participation in the achievements of the race. Where else in all of education will such an opportunity be better presented to achieve this expansion of one's awareness than in our three fields of health education, physical education, and recreation?

Would it be too far-fetched to say that our society is, or at least ought to be, concerned about the relation of humanity to the biomass of which it is a part in the ratio of about 1 to 10,000? Victor Shaffer suggests, in the October 1973 *Smithsonian,* that killing, whether it is of people in political wars or electric chairs, or of animals in the wild, can be erosive to the human spirit. The conservationists are telling us that the violence we bring to life is counterproductive to our species. It becomes difficult to speak of the conservation of human life in isolation from the conservation of all living things, and therefore, the health educator is implored to cast his or her view of conservation in the light of both outer and inner nature—for wild animals and for humanity. There is, after all, only a slim line of differentiation between the survival requirements of humans and those of other forms of living things. The lesson is clear: if humanity is to survive free, it had better see to it that it lives in some sort of ecological harmony with its environment.

It ought to be clear to us all that no one yet has charted, nor will anyone ever chart, the boundaries of any of our three fields. We are not now and will never be finite. Each of them involves experience as one seeks to develop, survive, and expand one's ego within one's environment. Thus, when we face the curious bit of educational administration by which we are required to construct a curriculum for health instruction, we face a task that, by its very nature, has to be repeated every year. Why? Because one's experience, needs, and interests never remain static. They are always expanding into new realms. One of the principal compulsions of the educational process is to lead into ever-deepening and widening social and scientific spheres. Curriculum limits can be determined only by the intellectual maturity of the students involved.

Just how extensive do you see these fields of health education and physical education? Limited to the contents of any good high school textbook? Circumscribed by the circulatory glow following a good "workout"? We have, so far, created many scenarios, each devoted to an exploration of some aspect of human behavior as it relates to and helps us form a concept of human nature. The exercise physiologists come up with a fragment of knowledge regarding interval training. The dietician tells us something about vitamin C and the common cold. Useful information, but it must never be forgotten that as we seek wisdom and understanding of the human being, the realities of the human state cannot be exhausted by any of its single projections. Any particular human phenomenon always reflects a state of being. A study can be fruitful only if there is an awareness of the whole to which the fragments can be related. There is no particular harm in either discovering or learning about these fragments of knowledge concerning the human being (there very well may be something in cigarette smoke that predisposes to emphysema), but unless one has a vision of wholeness, unless one is predisposed to understanding wholeness, it will not be possible to use the full import of the value of fragmented knowledge.

Basic, then, to any study of the contribution of our various sciences would be the development of an intellectual vision of the whole. There should be no confusion between an understanding of the *whole* person versus a conception of the whole but fragmented person. Under these conditions, all of the fragmented and ostensibly unrelated contributions of physics and chemistry, microbiology and physiology, and all the others could be woven into a huge tapestry descriptive of the nature of the human and useful to us as the ultimate reference for instruction in health education.

Health education, broadly defined, includes more than the instructional aspects of a program. I care not that there are some whose vision is so provincial that they try to limit their concept of health education only to those things that go on in a classroom with the usual appurtenances of teaching. That is far too narrow to make good sense. The broader view stems from the simple concept that whatever happens to us is educating, and if we plan good things as a part of a school program to include immunization programs, physical examinations, hearing tests, and vision screening, then those things are educational as well as medical in their impact and thus become a part of a broadly defined program of health education. It follows that what we call school health services and the development of a healthful school environment become, with the instructional program, a tripartite program of school health education. No matter that a variety of professional personnel is needed. That does not alter the fact that when a child is immunized for smallpox, it is an educational experience as well as a medical one. By the time you add up all the things that happen to a child in school that may or do have a bearing upon the child's health, you have a broad program of health education. Any more limited and restricted concept is so unrealistic as to be absurd.

One of the promising, relatively new aspects of all this is the gratifying rise of interest in the medicine of learning. We are watching the expansion of medical interest in organized education, from the supervision of vision testing and immunization programs and other such relatively simple processes to an approach to a thorough study of medical problems involved in learning. What can medicine offer in the instance of the slow learner? Is the lazy child anemic? Is the underachiever not merely not motivated, but is there a functional disorder present that may be nutritional or endocrinological in origin? Is there a dyslexia or functional word-blankness behind a reading disability? What are the neurologic involvements in reading disability? Are we interested in discovering any asthenia, autism, or hormonal deficiencies? Do energy-absorbing factors, parent rejection, insomnia, delayed sexual development, or sibling rivalry put a damper on learning?

This sort of exploration has a significant bearing upon the program of prevention, correction, and development that we arrange under the aegis of health education. It is good to see. Let us hope that as people give thought and attention to the broad and general development of education as a whole, they remember that the quality of learning depends upon the quality of the tissue doing the learning.

How can one be free if one has no basis in knowledge for an ability to separate the real from the fraudulent or to pick to pieces the massive flood of advertising with which we are drenched every day? I shudder to think of the millions of our people who are not free but held within the shackles of ignorance as they struggle with their problems of anxiety, genetic handicaps, allergies, nutritional deficiencies, marital discord, infirmities, suicidal tendencies, depressions, and others and who, because they have not cultivated an understanding of these things in their school health education, become victims of the multimillion-dollar program of quackery rampant in our society.

Those were some of the things that I thought about as I tried to figure out what the Armenian from Des Moines was trying to tell me. To live in a free society, we have to learn certain personal and social skills, accept certain responsibilities, do certain things and refrain from doing certain others. I am convinced that our three fields are potentially in the center of this endeavor. We can become, if we are not already, central forces in the development of the science of human experience. Let's get with it, because "you teachers are the most important people in the world!"

Physical Education in Higher Education

As colleges and universities examine their places in the structure of American life, they emphasize their dual role of meeting the continuous need for broadening the individual while preparing the individual professionally for useful service. To meet the first responsibility requires a complex of curricular and noncurricular endeavors, participation within which is likely to enrich the scope, broaden the outlook, and produce the "liberally educated person." Human needs for growth are not terminal, answerable once and for all by "a course." They are continuous, varied, and involve the unified nature of the organism. Thus, some of the experiences within a university are designed to impart knowledge, some emphasize its use and interpretation, but others deal more with the student's own life. Physical education serves this last function. Admittedly, it does not operate in every respect as other "courses." But, true to its heritage in early Greek tradition, its aim is to enrich the understanding of students of themselves, to provide them with the means for a thoughtful "administration" of their own lives, to aid them in the development of the ability to accept themselves. It operates in a medium of personal development.

This makes it none the less "academic." There is nothing in any definition of the term that would categorize such efforts as are thoughtfully expended by a modern program of physical education as "nonacademic." Only if efforts in

---

Prepared for a discussion by the Academic Council of the Ohio State University of the relation of physical education to general education, November 1960.

the "classical, literary, and mathematical pursuit" ignore the student completely and eliminate entirely the human equation in their teaching would physical education disclaim relationship to the best in the academic world.

But its laboratories—the play fields, gymnasia, and pools—are not laboratories where bridges are planned or formulas tested. Nor do we seek in them new strains of bacteria or new spectral phenomena. They are laboratories where changes in human personality take place, where human resources are cultivated.

The availability of the department—its staff, facilities, and program—and its predictable atmosphere attracts students. They mingle. They learn from each other. If Henry Steele Commager, the historian, is correct when he says that much of education takes place in the association of students, then the program is significant in offering this kind of opportunity.

What is the quality and character of the experience in physical education? The experience is developmental, not remedial. There are some who believe that physical education at the college level is like remedial mathematics—good only for those who have not had it in high school or who need it only for some therapeutic type of physical development. This view is largely inaccurate. The developmental needs of college students are real and continuous. They are manifest in all students, not just a few. These needs do not disappear with age. To remove such a program from the schedules of the vast majority of college students would remove a part of experience clearly needed for best development.

As J. F. Williams has suggested, it must be appreciated that every human experience is a magnificent mixture. We may identify one element as more prominent than another, but we misunderstand the nature of experience whenever we regard any act as exclusively composed of the quality with which we attempt to endow it. Experience is an interaction of the whole organism with its environment, and the environment includes other persons as well as tradition, customs, and the local physical surroundings. Indeed, so clear is this fact that medicine, jurisprudence, and education have rewritten their practices in order to take into account the total situation—the individual reacting to and interacting with all the forces of the environment that play upon the materials of the human being. Because every experience embodies the reaction and interaction of the individual to and with the environment, the experience cannot be purely physical or purely mental. Only the need for identification breaks experience into such categories as spiritual, mental, social, moral, intellectual, or physical. These are terms of convenience and largely without reality. Although common sense recognizes that one factor may be dominant, *it is never wholly exclusive.*

We shall keep the balance even, if we remember that the physical experience is physical in its outward manifestation but mental and emotional, social and moral, in its relationships and meanings. One may not like the physical, but it remains, permanent and abiding, going on from generation to generation.

The movement experience itself has emphases of its own that are not inconsequential. It aids with the identification of self in a way that cannot be duplicated. It is a form of nonverbal communication reflecting a nonverbal intelligence that is expressive, creative, and continuously serving as a medium for learning.

From such a viewpoint it is apparent that both the cult of muscle and the singular search for intellectual development as the only valid outcome of education leave much to be desired. Each viewpoint neglects the implications of unity. The modern spirit in physical education seeks the education of the human being through physical activities as one aspect of the social effort for human enlightenment.

This recasting of the scene for physical education is no superficial move, but a tendency toward deeper growth. It holds that we need to aim higher than health, than victorious teams, than strong muscles, than profuse perspiration. It sees physical education primarily as a way of living and seeks to conduct its activities so as to set a standard that will surpass the average and the commonplace. There is in such a view something of the loftier virtues of courage, endurance, and strength; the natural attributes of play, imagination, joyousness, and pride; and through it all, the spirit of splendid living—honest, worthy, and competent—so much desired by each individual.

Physical education, however, stands not alone in the dilemma of special disciplines. All of education has been, and still is, confronted with the problem. The old scholastic and Puritan doctrines that separated mind from body, that held the body as essentially evil, have emphasized the contrast today between an education for life and an education for death. Education for life, or modern education, and education through the physical, or modern physical education, have mutual supports and confidences. Education for life can hardly be conceived without generous allowance for this kind of physical education, but physical education pointed at its own culture, at its own minor objectives, becomes not an education for life at all. The identity, then, of education for life (modern education) and education through the physical (modern physical education) requires understanding by educators of the aim, scope, and objectives of modern physical education and by physical educators of the objects and concerns of modern education. Education through the physical will be judged even as education for life will be judged—by the contribution it makes to fine living. It should therefore be declared that physical education seeks to further the purposes of modern education when it stands for the finest kind of living.

From the proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on Higher Education (1957) have come many significant statements relative to the character and purpose of general education. From Professor Mayhew, formerly of Michigan State University, we quote this rather explicit description:

> General education seeks to achieve a number of educational values, such as the development of abilities to read, write, speak, listen, think, be an effective citizen, use leisure wisely, be an effective family member, and regulate one's life with regard for the principle of sound mental and physical health. These goals, or very similar ones, have come to be accepted by students and by most faculty members throughout the country. They are also coming to be accepted by various important lay and professional groups which exercise some measure of influence over undergraduate curricula.

The experience a student receives in physical education or health education very clearly contributes to a number of these values in a rather substantial way. To use leisure wisely, to be an effective family member, and to "regulate one's life with regard for the principle of sound mental and physical health" are directly within the vortex of departmental purposes and program.

In 1954 when Frederic Heimberger, vice-president for instruction and research, the Ohio State University, Columbus, wrote his belief that "our baccalaureate degree should attest to the fact that its recipient has successfully completed a course of study designed with care to develop individuals of considerable breadth of understanding, and having reasonable command of certain basic skills," did he have in mind the experience one gets in physical education? Dr. Heimberger hopes the course of study will "nurture the student's awareness of his possibilities for his continuing growth as a person . . . and aid in the fullest possible development of the student as an intelligent, discriminating, effective individual." From experience in physical education come unmistakable signs of such growth, of a maturity derived from participation in both health education and physical education.

Cardinal Newman would describe the liberally educated person as one who "has common ground with every class . . . who is a pleasant companion . . . whose mind has resources for happiness at home when it cannot be abroad." From experience in physical education can come such understanding and such talent.

The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education advises that students should be helped to attain a "satisfactory emotional and social adjustment" to their world. Within games and sports the well-educated player can manifest such adjustment.

Within virtually every description of a liberally educated person or of general education, the physical education experience contains a potential contribution. The field of sport, the experience in play, the world of movement are roundly developmental and personally educative. They contain not only ingredients of their own but have the added advantage of being able to provide an opportunity for students to practice what they have learned elsewhere. Experience in the practical and realistic laboratory in human relations, which a gymnasium is, affords insights into race relations, the nature of democratic action, ethical behavior, and other social and biological phenomena.

Dance adds another dimension to physical education not hitherto mentioned. As an art form it contributes to the cultural and creative development of students, essential ingredients in a balanced basic education. Dance as art possesses its own authority and its own enlightenment. It is intellectually as well as physically developmental. It is emotionally enriching. The force in art that has to do with beliefs, dedication, and spiritual energy, that leads to sharpened values by which people come to know themselves and others, surely has an important place in a university.

The case is clear, sure, and unmistakable that physical education is one facet of the general education of the student.

There are some who insist that curricular elements make unique contributions. In composition one learns to write; in arithmetic, to figure. But surely no one believes those skills are all one learns from those sources, or that no other sources contribute to those skills. So it is with physical education. The human organism being what it is, and experience being such a magnificent mixture, it is impossible to claim uniqueness for physical education.

If there is an emphasis indigenous to the program, it is in the development of fitness. Some would call it "physical" fitness—a derivative sometimes of muscle development. Humans being active creatures, possessed of great vital systems upon which their welfare depends, use muscular development not merely for strength at work but because muscular development is interdependent with all other systems. Without strength the organism fails.

There need be no apology for exercise. It may be unpopular with some. It may represent values held in low esteem by those who believe the "body" to be crass and the "mind" exalted. But all such regard for physical activity denies the intellectual integrity of those who hold the value low. They betray how little they know of the facts, the true nature of humans. Those who would cultivate the intellect alone as a goal of education are victims of their own spurious intellectualism and need to be brought up rather sharply against the facts of life.

Fitness is that state that characterizes the degree to which a person is able to function. It implies the ability of each person to live most effectively within his or her potentialities. Ability to function depends upon the many components of fitness, all of which are related to each other and all mutually dependent. Human development takes place only in that way. Leave one component out and the total organism suffers.

If the physical education experience has something to do with muscular activity, either currently or in terms of future use, then its relation to fitness is clear. Without exercise, without educated attention to all the components of fitness, no educational program can fairly be judged either realistic or maximally productive.

Thirty-seven million people were boating on the fresh or salt waterways of the nation last summer. There were 8 million golfers, 7 million tennis players, 60 million fishermen and hunters. There is a practical relation between this kind of leisure activity and college physical education. The latter should and does provide the skills and understandings that make participation pleasurable. University physical education does not embrace as its prime responsibility the pleasant team games of adolescence. It moves beyond those into the realm of adult activity and makes an effort to supply the college student with opportunity for experience in attractive and active leisure pursuits.

It is a learning-teaching situation and the instructional effort is done with care and thoroughness. The leisure needs of American men and women offer a clear challenge to colleges and to the physical education departments within those colleges. The needs should be met. Instruction in these areas place the physical education of students clearly within the orbit of their ''general education.''

We Learn from the Culture of People

Modern physical education can give strength to the social and political culture of the day. In what do we believe? In equality among persons?

Applied to physical education, what does the concept of equality of opportunity mean? It means that all students are entitled to a physical education program geared to their interests and abilities. Girls should have opportunities equal to boys, and the atypical should have opportunities suited to their needs and abilities. A physical education class or an athletic event is, in a small way, a laboratory where interracial, interreligious, intersexual, interregional, intergroup problems of any kind can be worked out. The solution is not always apparent, nor is it always easy—but it is always discoverable, and the opportunity is always present to make the ideal a reality.

An intelligently developed physical education program will be a model for a sophisticated and enlightened society that holds all persons worthy of admiration. All persons therefore will be given opportunities to prove themselves and to seek their own potential. Help will be given to both the disadvantaged and the advantaged so that both may have the satisfaction of achieving their potential. Equality of opportunity does not mean equality of opportunity to achieve mediocrity. It means the opportunity to reach one's highest excellence. The

---

Adapted from an address to teachers in Emporia, Kansas, March 30, 1951.

development of athletic stars is one of the obligations of a good physical education program. An "athletic aristocracy" is evil only if there is no just way to become a member. As long as the group is "open" and can be entered by virtue of accomplishment, there is little to worry about. The physical educator will honor the star, but will refuse to allow him or her to monopolize the time, money, equipment, and space of the physical education program.

It is a common practice to use athletics as the "whipping boy" of modern education. There are many that complain about an overemphasis upon athletics. What exactly do they mean? Perhaps they feel that a school gives too much "time away from studies" for athletics. Or that athletics are a nuisance with their unscheduled pep rallies, their strutting drum majors, their card tricks. Or they are repelled by the arrogance of a few big athletes who act as if they own the school. Maybe they are complaining that the athletic program "gets everything," and there is nothing left for the other aspects of education.

One point of view holds that as long as the competitive athletic program follows socially acceptable lines, makes no extraordinary demands upon the school calendar, and is a wholesome influence upon its participants, it is not "overemphasized" and should be raised to higher levels. Perhaps no program of physical education, including athletics, can be overemphasized until every boy and girl in the school has the opportunity to learn and to be satisfyingly successful in a sport or other recreational activity of his or her choice. There is surely a tendency toward underemphasis. To apply the concept to equality of opportunity fully, the right of the highly skilled to his or her fullest development must be preserved against those who would deny it.

Equality of opportunity requires that differing aspects of the program be of equal worth. It is a popular weakness to hold excellence in some sports of greater value than excellence in others. If a girl is a good horsewoman, is she held in higher or lower esteem than her classmate who is a good basketball player? If a boy is a football player and a good one, is he thus "better" than the golfer or the tennis player who is actually as good in his sport? What are the implications behind the spurious and undemocratic distinctions between major and minor sports? What gives an activity status? That an activity does not draw a big "gate" is of no consequence to its educational value, nor is it any reason that the opportunity for status gain should not be equal. *The thing that makes a sport major or minor is the contribution that sport makes to the one who plays it*. Football is a major sport to a football player, but not to a tennis player; fencing is a major sport to a fencer. Any other consideration to determine importance is unsound educationally and is either (a) a reflection of the domination of commercial or financial considerations or (b) an interesting form of snobbery in which those who play before the biggest crowds award themselves the biggest letters and have the biggest banquets. In school sports all letters should be equal in size; all recognition of letter winners the same; and talent, wherever found, encouraged and developed to the fullest. There should be equality of opportunity to excel with status in anything that one attempts to do.

Equality of opportunity means having the same chance at the use of facilities and equipment. Physical education and recreation programs are benefiting from the 20th-century reinterpretation of "public wealth." In the earlier days of the republic it was difficult for many to see that human rights transcended in importance property or material rights. We had, and have, a capitalistic system devoted to the preservation of individual enterprise. In the 19th century, that devotion allowed great forest tracts to be bought for cutting, long stretches of shore to be used for railroads, and all areas in a city to be built on. Long hours of labor were required to earn a living. Slowly the nation has revalued human rights. Now national and state parks are preserved for the people's pleasure. Large apartment communities with playground facilities for children are built where tenements and factories were before. Shorter working days and shorter working weeks present more leisure in which to pursue the good things in life. We are looking more and more at "public wealth" as including contentment, joy, a good home, and good recreational facilities.

This concept has evolved because the typical American has believed that if something is good but is available only to a few it should be examined to see if it could not be made available to the masses. Take golf for instance. Golf was imported as a rich-man's game. One had to have fancy knickerbocker pants and money for club membership; only the elite played. That did not last long. Golf was a good thing. People liked it. It thus became the property of the public, and now municipal golf courses are scattered all over the country and everyone can play the game. Golf has become a victim of democracy! There is now equal opportunity for all to play.

The current vast recreation movement is the result of the application of this facet of democracy. Public swimming pools, parks, clubhouses, playgrounds, fishing preserves, trailer parks, campsites; organized dramatic groups, choruses, baseball teams, bowling leagues; and hundreds of other enterprises are significant evidence that the democratic American wants everyone to share the good things. Physical education personnel may do two things in this connection: help provide the good things and teach people how to use them and use them well.

The concept of equality of opportunity has been mainly responsible for the problem now confronting us with regard to amateurism. Amateurism, in its original English setting, was a social distinction. The amateur was a gentleman. The gentleman was a landowner. He did not have to work because he had money. He turned to sports for fun, distinction, and probably relief from boredom.

Americans reject the idea of activities designed exclusively for a select few and hold the professional player and the "gentleman" player in equal esteem, judging each on his talent—if a man is good enough, he is good enough. Thus, it is difficult to persuade young Americans that there is something evil about receiving money for playing games—earning money for almost everything else is highly regarded. The people of the world are slowly beginning to acknowledge that game performance should be the only criterion and, here and there, are giving amateurs and professionals equal opportunities to compete for and win championships. Tennis has made a strong move in this direction. Golf is acknowledging both the professional and amateur.

The question of amateurism is further complicated by the different international interpretations of the word. Contesting countries in the Olympic games, for example, have widely varying standards of amateurism. To many, where the money comes from to pay the athlete makes not a shred of difference. If the money to enable training is advanced by the government that is no different than if it is advanced by public subscription. Perhaps we will some day approach the idea that a country should send to the Olympics its best athletes and forget that they should be "amateurs." Such a policy would go a long way toward providing equality of opportunity for the participation of the best and would make honest the assertions and the principles to which the Olympic champions subscribe.

Our culture places a high premium upon excellence. We disavow mediocrity. We want everyone to have a chance, but we applaud the one who stands out as the best. We cheer the great teams because they represent the superlative development of the individual and the coordinated teamwork of a group. Both have made this country famous. A modern physical education program provides both, for the dub and the expert, the ordinary person and the All-American, and neither may claim more than his or her share of what the state has provided.

Through the Looking Glass

We look through the looking glass to see where we are, and what we see is not always a happy vision. We have great strengths and we should emphasize them. We also have great vulnerabilities and we should change to remove them. Let us look at some of the vulnerable spots.

In recent years we have scattered our forces. One wonders now whether we represent a solid front with a single purpose. We used to be the American Physical Education Association; then we became the Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Now we are the American Alliance. There is talk of split-offs from that. One wonders, now, who we are. Are we people representing health education, physical education, recreation, safety education, driver training education, athletics, fitness programs, physical training, cheerleading, drill teams, something ROTC is a substitute for, or just what? We are not like the Modern Language Association or the American Physical Society or the American Psychiatric Association or the American Association of Music Teachers—who seem to have a cluster of related goals having to do with the basic education in their particular area of interest. But when we get shot at by our critics, there does not seem to be a single body to rise up and answer those critics forcefully in terms of what we represent in the education of children. We need to consolidate our forces and speak out firmly

---

Delivered at the annual meeting of the New York State Health, Physical Education and Recreation Association, Buffalo, January 23, 1960.

and authoritatively about what we are and what we believe and what the contribution is that we make to American education.

Another vulnerable spot lies in the fact that our boundaries of recognized professional status are shaky. It seems that almost anybody can claim to be a physical education teacher—maybe he has a law degree and a glib tongue, maybe she wears a purple cape or is a television star writing frequently in slick magazines. We have people who pay homage to the body flexible and who prance around the stage in silver leotards. There are quacks all over the place; there are fakers promoting their curious notions and making hay out of the body beautiful. We have dozens of exercise boys advocating everything from stick drills and barrel-course exercises to the water cure.

Many of us are confused. We confuse ends with means. There are those who believe that physical exercise is the end, the desideratum of physical education—that exercise or the "workout" is an end in itself and not a means. There are those who are under the impression that the championship or the Rose Bowl or just a plain victory is in itself the end—the most desirable thing there is. Weight training to many becomes merely the end of their experience in physical education. And there are those who speak the gibberish of sport for sport's sake, which of course is utterly ridiculous.

A decade or so ago, we tested some 10 million children in schools and came up with the remarkable conclusion that a large and dangerous percentage of our children were "unfit." When anybody asked the question, "unfit for what?" we were dubbed subversive in our attitude toward the goals of our national association. That whole testing program showed some interesting things. Of course it showed that there were some people who were not muscularly prepared to do what is expected of them. Of course it showed up some immediate weaknesses in the status, both medical and psychological, of many children. Of course it whetted the appetite of some to intensify the vigor of the physical activity program in schools. One wonders, however, whether the results were worth the price we paid. We wonder whether that vast and important testing program created in some the desire to continue a lifetime of activity—whether it was appealing, attractive, enjoyable. We produced sweat by the bucketful. But isn't it interesting that at about the time that testing program was going on, we lost the requirement of physical education and health education in probably 50 major universities and colleges in this country? Wasn't it interesting that at about that time, we underwent a reappraisal of our place in the educational world and very little of what we lost has been regained? One wonders if we were not baying at the moon of fitness to satisfy a popular notion at the time. Those who really control education—people who have membership in the Educational Policies Commission or other important educational groups—gave us merely a passing and perhaps tolerating glance.

Even though we claim to be educational, we have abused the basic tenet of educational practice—namely, repetition. We teach volleyball year after year, basketball and softball year after year, swimming to those who already can swim, touch football to those who already can play touch football. In school after school an examination of any given class or year will show that the activities performed in the physical education class are the same activities the children performed last year. And yet, in some places, we complain of a crowded curriculum! At what point does the law of diminishing returns operate? At what point do we ignore and do violence to good educational principle and practice?

We have witnessed, and in many places we have protested, the utter degradation of sport. We have seen behavior at basketball games among participants and spectators reach a new low level. We have seen hardnosed violence and admired it in many places. We have tolerated the misbehaving tennis player or the cheating golfer. We have, in many places, allowed to go without protest sharp practice and dirty play to the point where the practice of sport on its finest ethical plane is a rarity and the arts of peaceful existence on the playfield are not always seen. And yet one of our great strengths, which we see through a properly conducted sport program, is the development of the best of humanity, in which sport becomes a pleasant interlude, enriching our understanding of each other, in which we test our skill against the other person in an atmosphere of pleasant rivalry, and where we give, above all, a manifestation of clear-cut and reasonable democracy in action through the administration of the principle of equality of opportunity.

The prototype of sport at its best may not be found, perhaps, in the organized effort within the school. We have seen it in America in the activity of the hunter or the camper or the skier, the outdoorsman, the fisherman, the one who walks the beach or takes a pleasant climb up the mountain. Somehow, when we bring these things into an organized setting, we seem to slip away from the idea that the important part of participation is that of value—personal and group—which comes from the kind of interaction these activities provide.

We need to give more encouragement to innovation, to creativity, and to sport participation without fear of disgrace from defeat or the disgusting overadulation to the victor. We need to strengthen our premium placed upon individuality and upon the social ethic through the sport situation.

There is also an excellent opportunity, if we would but pursue it, of bringing a stronger type of intellectualism to the program. Our strengths must be found in our history. It should never be forgotten that the process we call physical education is old phylogenetically. It has been here for 10,000 years, and it will be here for 10,000 more. It is an ancient survivor of human group activity as well as individual enterprise. It has become now what it was then, a part of the learning process in which the organism became receptive to learning the modes of behavior that were transmitted through participation in the sports, games, and dances of the ages. This process we cannot destroy. We can only enhance it. Once we see that we have a life to educate and the means with which to do it, if we would quit trying to make something out of our games that they are not or trying to advance them for our own motive or glory and just try to maintain through our own wit, intelligence, and skill the orderly process of teaching the great lessons of a liberal education through our activities, perhaps we could obtain what President Bixler of Colby College was talking about when he said that the purposes of a liberal education are to help people understand the difference between the good and beautiful and the cheap and shoddy. There is definition enough for us. Can there not be some thread of understanding running through experience in physical education that goes beyond sweat and victory into the deep understanding of human problems? I think so.

Our problem is to bring to the countless thousands of our students the quiet satisfactions of achievement, of acceptance, of confidence—to bring to the average, the dub, the girl or boy who may not be outstanding, the quiet confidence of the knowledge that she or he is capable of hitting a golf ball or dancing or bowling or camping or canoeing or handling a sail.

In the evolution and, perhaps, revolution in American education, we cannot stand alone, nor can we stand knee deep in confusion. We have so much to give, so much talent with which to give it. We must not allow our basic programs of recreation or of health education or of physical education to go to waste.

And so through the looking glass we see so many stereotyped misconceptions of physical education that a highly motivated and competent teacher in the field will find an enticing and compelling opportunity to destroy these misconceptions at every opportunity. Among them are the following:

1. That body development is an end in itself.
2. That the human heart is structurally unable to stand the vigors of extreme tasks.
3. That all athletes are dumb—or they wouldn't be athletes.
4. That the intellectual interest of physical education teachers is low.
5. That exercise itself is childish, and one ought to abandon it after adolescence.
6. That the trichotomy of body, mind, and spirit exists, and that body is low on the totem pole.
7. That exercise and physical education are the same thing.
8. That the physical makes no contribution to experience.
9. That winning is all—there is nothing else.
10. That "nice guys finish last."

11. That the physical educator knows little about constructive educational philosophy, curriculum practice, or administration. We will survive, of course, but we will continue to survive more comfortably if we will destroy those myths in popular opinion.

Concepts of Administration

In the evolution of social thought and practice there have appeared various types of administrative activity. Society is constantly trying to create a kind of administrative practice that will secure the ideals for which it strives. Over the centuries great social patterns have appeared—the socialist, the communist, the fascist, the dictatorial, the democratic. No social system can survive if its administration betrays it.

Leadership in a democracy, as elsewhere, means administrative power. And there are many who search for power through the administrative role—men and women who are tempted by and succumb to the lust for administrative control. Often these people have been rugged individualists and have given immense vitality to business—and to education. In the 18th and 19th centuries, there were great spirits in education who stood for what they believed or wanted and who by one means or another created an educational structure in which power was not the least of the emoluments.

In physical education this individualism assumed various forms—some amusing, some annoying. It produced the strutting martinet who called commands, made decisions, ordered things to be done, and administered programs of physical education conceived within the watertight compartments of his own doctrinaire mind. He seldom changed, he seldom listened, he never read.

Adopted from the textbook *Physical Education*, New York: Harper & Row, 1951.

Students were his meat and he devoured them. He imposed his will because *he* knew best what was "good" for all people.

There was also the power-oriented administrator who wore an iron hand in a glove of velvet. This individual had been autocratically schooled and believed he or she had similar autocratic responsibility to the staff and students. He was possessive about *his* staff, *his department*, *his* students, *his* program; and he made sure that those who did not acknowledge the worth of his administration were sent to other fields for pasturing. He demanded loyalty whether he earned it or not and expected respect as an adjunct to his title.

In autocratic situations such as these, tension, individual hostility, and lack of stability in the group membership are frequent and characteristic outcomes. Fear is the auxiliary of these people no matter how well-meaning they believe their administrative policies to be.

Another type of physical education administrator became, in some instances, so all-powerful that he surpassed in influence even the superintendent of schools or the president of the university. Through the decades it has taken to produce the current huge program of interscholastic sport, there has emerged the modern educational counterpart of the 19th century timber baron—the athletic director who never teaches, never confers, never submits a problem to group discision, always decides himself, cares little for students, and spends long hours in the counting house planning budgets for the far-flung athletic empire he has built. Under such administrators, the educational aspects of sport and games become secondary to the financial gain and amassed publicity which assure status and prestige. Administration becomes a method by which self-aggrandizement is attained. It is singularly unfortunate for the general field of physical education that in some schools and colleges the program has been placed under the leadership of such a person. Girls' programs, particularly, are known to suffer neglect because of the unsympathetic attitude of the "head man" who knows or cares little about the overall objectives of physical education.

At the same time, there has emerged a brand of ineffectual, inefficient administration in education and in physical education. People with power have simply not known how to use it. Programs have been allowed to rot, to fall to pieces, to disintegrate. Or they have grown only so far and no further. Here one finds the physical education program made up of a limited number of activities. Although the school possesses facilities for more, no additions are ever made because of some small administrative obstacle that seems insurmountable at the time. One sees programs of vigorous physical education without towels for bathing; without lines on the fields; with makeshift bases on the diamonds; with sleepy, lazy, and unambitious teachers; and with locker rooms that would profit from the use of a broom. Such matters are administrative. They are marks of an inefficiency or ineptness that jeopardizes the value of the physical education program to the educational system and the student.

Of course, hundreds of high schools and colleges have effective, useful, and skillfully handled programs. There are administrators who have set up administrative practices in accord with the needs of the students, the relative ease with which these needs can be met, and the determination to make of physical education a force for democratic living. These administrators are thoughtful, erudite, sensitive men and women.

The good administrator sees himself as a sort of executive servant, one who carries out the will, meets the needs, executes the desires of the group. He is responsive to group action, participates in the formulation of group opinion, seeks and distributes information on the problems at hand, guides group thinking into orderly channels, but in the end he administers the program in terms of the expressed wisdom of the group. He is not afraid to make decisions when they are his to make, but he does not "pull rank" when he has delegated decision making. Such an administrator conceives of his job as that of making others comfortable, of facilitating teaching, of enhancing the richness of the program. True democratic administration seeks to serve, not dominate; guide, not order; and act, not defer.

The personal standards of the physical education teacher and administrator are of unusual importance. Although every teacher in the school is expected to exemplify the best in character and personal integrity, there are circumstances in the physical education and athletic setting that give added emphasis to this necessity. In the first place, there are times when the physical education teacher-administrator, like the band conductor and the director of the glee club, is on public display—parents and the general public are likely to know him and be aware of his private as well as his working behavior. This visibility gives the coach a special sort of status. What he does, what he says, even the clothes he wears are noticed and frequently imitated. There has always been a certain amount of hero worship associated with leadership in sport, and both the man and the woman in physical education may as well accept this circumstance and *turn it to the advantage of the students.*

Because of the special fascination the athletics and sports phase of physical education programs have for a large segment of the public, the physical education teacher-administrator generally meets a good many more people than do other members of the school staff—the fans; the team followers; the personnel of press, radio, and television; anxious parents; people from competing schools; representatives from professional sport; and, in some instances, gamblers and other curious characters who hang onto the fringe of sport. The teacher-administrator must learn what can be safely said, how to say it, and in general how to conduct himself in public life so that the students and the program gain rather than lose from these contacts.

Also, this public interest engenders the so-called "pressures" under which some coaches work. The more intense the pressures, the more difficult it is to maintain one's stability and purpose. The temptations to side with vested interests, to play favorites, to grant special privilege, to resent criticism, to lose one's temper are all very real, and difficult situations abound. This aspect of the program certainly demands stability and integrity of its administrators.

Another reason for the premium on personal integrity in physical education is that the budget for the program is usually relatively high. Money is spent for equipment, money is charged for games and exhibitions, funds representing certain special aspects of the program must be administered, interscholastic monies are used in flexible ways. The administrator has to learn early in life how to handle money, keep accounts, purchase equipment, and in general deal fairly and with scrupulous honesty in all such matters. There is often the temptation to become allied with outside interests. This may involve anything from a substantial discount from the local sports store because the equipment is purchased there to being approached for the endorsement of specific commercial products with all of the attendant national publicity. These fiscal responsibilities make integrity of the highest quality an absolute must for the physical educator.

Physical educators must make a very special effort to interrelate with others in the educational system. It is unfortunate when physical education teachers gain the reputation of being somewhat exclusive and unwilling to assume their share of educational responsibility or when the rest of the faculty believes the physical education teacher capable of dealing only with fitness and recreation and not with the intellectual aspects of school life. These attitudes seem to develop when the after-school activities keep the teachers away from faculty meetings or committee work. Physical education teachers, therefore, have a special obligation to attend faculty meetings as a matter of course (even though an occasional practice must go on under student leadership). They should make themselves available for committee work and should, in every way, represent the best in democratic participation and action within the school. Much of the criticism leveled at physical education, including athletics, comes from persons who are either uninformed or jealous of the prominence of the program. The presence of the teachers at meetings attended by other staff members gives a chance for discussion. Teachers of physical education must constantly remember they are teachers first and physical educators second. That is to say, the welfare of the total school program must constantly come before the welfare of any one area.

In relation to administrative officials, such as the principal, superintendent, deans, and board members, one should make every effort to cultivate a friendly informality developed within the traditional "table of organization." The principal is in charge of the total program; the superintendent, of the system; the dean, of the college; the president, of the university. These people carry large umbrellas of responsibility, and the physical education teacher-administrator must work closely with them and be mindful of their relationship. Problems of curriculum, public relations, and personnel should be related to the proper officials, and no physical educator should at any time assume the prerogative of administrative decision or policy making unless such right has been specifically designated as his.

There are some administrators who genuinely enjoy the prominence of their position and react to it with modesty, humility, and good sense. Others deliberately create a reputation as showmen. They conduct themselves as prima donnas, expect fanfare and trumpets when they appear, act the fool on the bench with their protests and grimaces, and generally manifest a pitifully moronic type of exhibitionism. A physical education administrator can analyze his own reactions in this regard and must early decide whether he wishes to become a professional educator in the field of human development or a vaudeville clown with little concern for values other than "the gate," the score, and his own reputation.

For the teacher-administrator who would choose the professional way, the responsibility for continued education is imperative. Physical education is a dynamic field. New ideas are constantly coming to the fore; productive research, experimentation with new ideas, different organizational plans, new methods, different equipment are revealed constantly. Investigations into child development, the role of creative activity, the effect of play on mental health, and the meaning of movement are all worth following. Professional meetings provide an exchange of ideas. Professional literature reports recent advances in all aspects of the program. Correlative areas such as the social sciences, anthropology, and physiology are constantly throwing light on problems associated with physical education. No administrator of physical education can afford, either morally or intellectually, to slacken his interest in the scholarly aspects of the discipline—he must keep up with the literature, attend meetings, and generally be alert and informed about the totality that is education and the specific "cutting edge" of physical education.

Some Contributions of Physical Education to an Educated Life

All living things use movement as an instrument of expression and impression. The amoeba under the glass will react to varying stimuli by moving around. The collie will express his joy at the return of his master by convulsive waggings and affectionate leaps. The runabout child learns that table legs are hard by toddling full tilt into one. Of the unpredictable number of sensory stimuli received by any living organism, a good share are made possible because that organism has the capacity to move about, to alter his environment by moving, and thus to create new and different worlds for himself that teach him important lessons. Likewise ideas conjured up within find their efferent expression in movements as diverse as the flicker of an eye or the mad stampede of a frightened mob. Ideas, feelings, emotions, drives, or moods frequently can find their most satisfactory expression only through a movement of parts coordinated so as to bring satisfaction as a return for its doing.

Mankind always has used this capacity for coordinated movement to serve his purposes. The savage ran to capture or escape, the primitive tribesman swung a club to beat off an attacker, the Indian danced to invoke the favor of the gods, and the early Greeks wrestled for fun and for the beauty of body development. Later on the middle Europeans danced to the folk songs of their festivals, the Swedes invented exercises for therapeutic purposes, and the English played games and hunted because it was such good sport. But as

---

Published in *The Journal of Health and Physical Education*, January 1945.

civilization has progressed it has made less and less urgent the need for movement as necessary to survival. Bullets take the place of clubs; carpenters build our houses for us; and the more these labor-saving substitutions develop, the more dancing, playing, swimming, and climbing we do just for the fun of it. We are neither inclined from choice nor predestined biologically to give up our capacity for muscular effort and retire to the armchair. If we do, we die.

What has happened in American education? Our schools and colleges were begun originally to train the mind. The early Puritanic philosophy held play as vulgar and schools would have none of it. The early pattern for American higher education was cut in the form of devotion to a dualistic intellectualism in which mind was an entity unrelated to the remainder of the organism. Actually the boys whose minds were trained at Harvard in the 17th century were not unlike the boys there now; so they played games, and when the lads at Princeton kicked an early American football through the chapel window they thus intruded the fact of their singleness of being into the sacred halls of this unsound intellectualism.

Shortly thereafter, in the 19th century, but unrelated to these impulses to play, physical training came into our schools. It had a Scandinavian and German ancestry. The English games were not a part of the beginnings of school physical training. German exercises and Swedish gymnastics prevailed. In community life, however, our pioneers hunted and fished and later they danced a little. They played games, either domestic or imported, and soon the school was doing one thing as physical training and people at large were doing others. The schools were at quite a loss to know what was the best for the children. The fatherlands all gave purpose to their physical training. Their exercise was for health, to discipline the youth of the land, or to celebrate an occasional festival. The American games seemed all for fun and amusement. Which of these purposes should the school adopt and develop its program to meet?

The 20th century has made the answer clear. We will have little of imported programs and purposes. We will choose some of the English rugby and develop American football, we will preserve and teach some old folk dances, we will run foot races as did the ancient Greeks; but we neglect soccer, are bored with calisthenics, use the Swedish horse to play on, and applaud but not perform the ballet. We are enthusiastic about tennis and golf (imported products), we invent baseball, and we ride and hunt and fish as all human beings do the world over. But we insist on our own purposes and our own development, and these are compatible with essential purposes of all education in this particular democracy. If American education aims at normal adjustment of the individual to his world then so does modern physical education in American schools. If the production of integrated personalities possessed of those qualities that make for effective living within a democracy is the general purpose then the activities that educate through these motor avenues must contribute to these ends. A physical education is productive of more than organic or "physical" gains. These are important, but other outcomes can and must be sought if one is to appraise fairly the place of physical education in the American program of education.

To gain such a view of the part motor activities play in the education of a person one must begin, of course, with a broad view of education itself. It must be seen as education for living rather than just schooling. The boundaries of blackboards, recitations, and lectures must not define academic respectability. The broad view sees education as a series of living experiences, and if books, or trips, or chalk, or games, or a tonsillectomy are necessary to enrich that life then those things are organized and arranged by skillful teachers as a part of the educational process. We are just beginning to understand what Dewey years ago pointed out—that it is the whole child we are educating, not just his memory centers. No picture of an educated life that has for its colors only the bright hues of poetry or the perspectives of mathematics will do. What a Hutchins or a Flexner may describe as their ideal of an educated life vanishes in the face of such rudimentary knowledge as science has given us about the relation of the psyche to the soma. Or as Williams has aptly put it,

> This view sees life as a totality . . . and the modern spirit in physical education seeks the education of man through physical activities as one aspect of the effort for human enlightenment. . . . The 'cult of music' becomes as ludicrous as those who worship at the altar of mental development. Neither point of view suffices, neither is accurate.[1]

Culture must be judged in terms of totality of expression. There is nothing new about that. Plato argued it in his *Republic*, and John Locke urged the recognition of motor activities as a way of living. Herbert Spencer clamored for the development of a physical education for men and women, and contemporary thinkers such as Dewey, Bode, Horne, Jacks, and others all have pronounced the validity of motor experiences as contributors to education.

But it is necessary to particularize. Muscular strength is surely not the only outcome of a physical education. Just what kinds of learning accrue? There are, potentially, five—all of which may be classified by other names, perhaps, and surely all of which depend for their existence in large measure upon the quality of leadership that seeks them. From participation one learns, first, the skills and strategy of the activity at hand; second, the health implications of the activity; third, the behavior controls involved in the activity situations; fourth, the satisfactions from self-expression, through the activity as a means; and fifth, the history, contemporary status, and relationships of the activity. These values, along with the health or organic values which we are not discussing here, are all potential. They may or may not accrue. Their fullest attainment depends upon good organization and expert teaching.

The first one can be disposed of quickly. It is obvious that one must learn how to *play* golf and that the strategy of tennis or football is not learned except through participation. The skills, the rules, and the plan for any game or dance are fundamental to the other values. Such learning is obviously as much of an "intellectual" exercise as it is a "physical" one. For our purposes let us assume an optimum mastery and move on to the other values.

From the activities, if properly taught, we can get an insight into health. Ringworm of the foot has spread because people are in ignorance of hygienic procedures following exercise. Success in athletics is dependent in some measure upon diet, sleep, and freedom from dissipation. Old lessons about healthful living spring normally and forcefully from such participation, and the refinements of the 20th century have not as yet developed an adequate substitute for a normal metabolism. If participation in activities calls up this kind of associate learning then the activities have added profitably to the sum of knowledge.

Third, the behavior controls involved in the activity may need some elaboration. Somewhere in the first year of life the behavior of the infant begins to take on social implications. His intra-uterine aloneness begins to disappear. He becomes related to others, first to his mother, then to family, then to playmates, and eventually he may develop a vision of the relation of himself to the world of people. This socializing process is not done without pain. The self-preservative drive is strong, and the competition or aggression manifested against other individuals is the result of it. In view of this, Arthur Timme holds it the duty of civilization in general and the school as its agent to modify this aggression into behavior useful in group life.[2] The hitting, shoving, and the biting of the child must be modified as he grows older.

Therein can be seen the effect of a physical education. "Play is training in socialization. By far the best and perhaps the only means of socializing the child," according to Timme.[3] Play weans him from self-centeredness to material objects, to playthings, to playfellows, to the group, to the world of people. This process goes on all the time, with or without leadership, with or without the school. The important thing is to give direction to it, plan its outcomes, and the school and its teachers are responsible for such direction-giving and behavior-planning. Note that we have not said this responsibility was solely that of the physical education teacher. No such position is tenable. The physical education teacher and program are in the vortex of such a socializing process but the influence of *all* teachers affects these changes.

Furthermore, these modifying changes go on continuously through life, and play always is an instrument. We may grow too old to participate so we watch; and the spectator, through the well known process of identification, expresses behaviors of a social nature and has modifications made of his conduct. He will live through the players he watches.

Kimball Young adds further evidence to this. He says,

> Recognition of the fact that the self arises from building up roles and the status that others require of us should convince us that a full life is possible only when we recognize the anticipation or claims of others upon us. This is exactly what socialization . . . means.[4]

Thus the activities of physical education may become a remarkable instrument for socialization. In games and in sports we learn to expect things of our friends and we know our friends are expecting things of us. We take on status; we become persons. We rise and fall as we try to meet these expectations. We learn to judge and to be judged, and when a friend fails to measure up, lets us down in a tight foursome, or fumbles at a crucial moment, we, because others have expected things of us, are more tolerant of him. We recognize his weakness and his despair because we share them. We do, that is, if we have played, if our physical education has been a full one. It is usually the person whose physical education has been neglected who is intolerant enough to shout his abuse when players make mistakes.

The full life is possible only when we accurately gauge our role, and know where we stand with reference to our friends. We play hide-and-go-seek, dodgeball, tennis, or squash-racquets, and if we disappoint others we can either correct our mistake, withdraw from the game, or have our errors forgiven. We insist on one of the three happening. Life is uncomfortable until one does. We will go to lengths to make one of these happen. The alibi has its origin in these circumstances. Where the act has failed, we attempt to verbalize away its consequences. We try to explain. We always want to be right, to be well thought of, and we do not always succeed. The recognition of the claims others have on us, or of the role others expect us to play becomes strikingly apparent through the materials with which organized physical education deals.

The technique of socialization then begins to appear. The teacher must make clear what is expected; he must instruct us in the use of the tools that will meet this expectancy, and when failure attends our efforts, he must provide opportunity suitable to our capacity for establishing a satisfying equilibrium with our fellows.

Young makes it even more explicit when he says that "social and emotional maturity is achieved only if the sense of freedom has a corresponding sense of responsibility."[5] In games or in a folk dance, the participant has freedom *and* responsibility. He cannot evade either. It was he who was caught off the bag, or flubbed his mashie shot, or missed his block, or who forgot to "set and turn single." When one enters an activity of this sort he has freedom, and if it takes responsibility to produce maturity then he has that also. His own actions become important to the team, the set, or even to the whole pageant. The player who errs can find few abilities to help him evade his own responsibility, and the teacher must see that he finds none save the true ones. These games are stern tests yet rich in opportunity for producing maturity. They help discipline and develop the weakling, they provide a growth opportunity for the "fringer," and they provide a yardstick for the one who is uncertain where he stands. Likewise they present a temptation for the egocentric who is expert at them and splendid and useful stimuli for the normally maturing personality.

It is within these spheres that good teaching is important. Bad teaching will be blind to this socializing process. It will permit egotism to take charge of some, cowardice and unhappiness born of consistent failure to spread in others, and complete lack of participation to be the lot of a few. Good teaching will, by paying attention to the individual differences, select and teach those activities holding most promise for socialization; it will be impatient with mass activities and prefer small groups where individual growth can be noticed; and it will help each individual undergo the socializing process to the end that he attains his full share of maturity.

In a republic where democratic personal relationships are expected to be the basis of the culture, it is not too much to expect that all of the areas within a curriculum will be capable of making a very real and demonstrable contribution to such democratic behavior in the individual. Can a contribution be made to such democratic living through physical education?

If the interplay of personality constantly found on the play field can be properly directed, the field, the court, the pool, the out-of-doors can be most significant as laboratories of the democratic process. Conversely men can be taught to hate each other, to hold others in disrespect, to take advantage, to "get the other guy," to nurse racial prejudices, to seek advantage, all through sport. In war, some of these latter qualities are necessary. American men cannot fight the enemy with kid gloves. Because we must win war we may have to forsake some of our notions of clean combat. Activities can be chosen and taught in physical education in such a way as to produce these fighting skills. But if the essence of the democratic way is to be measured by the quality of our respect for the other personality, then organized school and college physical education programs should be held strictly accountable for the kind and quality of teaching through their activities. Nothing may be tolerated that does not guide the student into a deepened and widened understanding of the democratic culture in which he lives.

Fourth, and irrevocably bound up with this socializing process, is the opportunity for normal personality adjustment and integration through and by the satisfactions arising out of self-expression. The very nature of physical education throws it into the center of this kind of learning. Physical education activities have a rich potential objectivity about them. Children play prisoner's base with all the realism they can muster. Sense of self in a handball game virtually disappears. Casting in a rushing stream gives small chance for any thoughts save those of the catch. All such activities, rightfully the material of a school-organized physical education can, when properly taught, produce an outward direction of consciousness judged helpful to normal adjustment. The player becomes so absorbed in what he is doing that he has little or no time for himself and his worries. Through such efforts, particularly when they are creative as in the dance, the objectivity of the activities makes some contribution to psychic integration. Richards is quoted as saying that play is our greatest ally in helping the personality that has become ingrowing to be outgrowing in its interest, desires, and responses.[8]

Some of these results occur strikingly through the use of a physical education for the handicapped. Victims of infantile paralysis, tuberculosis of the bone, heart defects, and others too frequently judged to be unfit to receive a physical education are sometimes put on the shelf. There they disintegrate not only whatever muscular tissue and strength may be left, but also they develop those complexes and grievances characteristic of the handicapped. It appears possible to allay all this through an individualized physical education. The victim of paralysis who hates all things athletic, who is almost completely introverted and thus selfish and intolerant, is taught to swim. He mingles with other swimmers, he becomes a man among men, he finds a new way of living. He is well along toward a social rehabilitation he needed badly. The blind can be taught to dance, the deaf to play games, the nervously unstable to catch and throw. The end results seem to be improved, in some instances, remade personalities. There are unexplored opportunities ahead in the field of physical education of the handicapped. We have only begun to experiment with it.

Less subtle of the values a well planned physical education will bring to the individual are the simple fun one gets from playing and dancing and the elemental satisfactions from having used one's leisure without having been bored. Fun, in itself, is valuable. Life need not all be serious business. We pay a heavy price for a laugh. We seem to welcome joy when it comes our way. Those things are obviously attainable through physical education activities.

The fifth type of learning, suggested as the history and contemporary status and relationships of the activities, holds some promise in its contribution to an educated life. Bode is reported to have said, "Give me thirty children at the gates of the stadium and I will reveal the world to them." He referred, no doubt, to the contemporary relationships of the activities that went on in the stadium and the stadium itself. Of what design is the building? What were its antecedents? Why do people build and use stadiums? What values have games? What of the history of the world is reflected in the structure and the uses to which it is put? It behooves the teacher to explore, to miss no opportunity to further the process of integrating all knowledge and activity. The dance, alone, provides as rich an opportunity for concomitant learnings as any other aspect of a physical education. Dancing in any form requires music, employs design, may be itself a creative art, and in its interpretative aspects draws its ideas from life and expresses them through the artistry of its movements.

From a class in physical education or social science may come the need for knowing of the nature and extent of recreational facilities in a community. Some one, somewhere, may ask of the relationship between playgrounds and juvenile delinquency. An insight into the study of human behavior under stress may be an outgrowth of the relationships between physical education and psychology. There is material here, not all of it vitai, not all of it interesting to all persons. The possibilities, however, have barely been touched.

The sum and substance of these potential contributions to an educated life point unmistakably to one thing. If the school harnesses these natural activities, uses them as a fundamental avenue of learning, calls the teaching of them "physical education," then it must recognize the importance of skilled leadership with sound scientific training. Wipe out every teacher and every program of physical education in schools today and the physical education of the race would still go on—albeit in a primitive fashion. The organized school is a product of civilization. It bends man's drives into social uses; it hopes to make the man himself integrated and complete. This hope makes necessary the teaching of physical education. But games alone will not do it. Just play without a plan, without thought, without direction, will make little contribution beyond the organic values to some of the more complicated problems of personality we face in today's school or college. Physical education teachers should know what they are doing. They should be students of the science of human development and educationists in the best sense of the word.

Thus physical education makes its contributions to the educated life. To attain them the program must be democratically administered and individually based; its games must be free from false values and unsound practices; its activities must have values that are most readily harvested by the participant. If we can develop that game, that contest, that activity in which the individual is used "not as a means merely but as an end" then the foundation upon which the superstructure of educational value may be raised will be safe.

For through a physical education we have the opportunity to help to bring man into possession of himself, to provide him with means for enjoying life, to give him friends and fun and the eminent satisfactions of doing something well. The educated life surely holds these things valuable.

NOTES

1. J. F. Williams, "Education Through the Physical," *Journal of Higher Education*, May 1930, p. 279.
2. Arthur R. Timme, "The Significance of Play and Recreation in Civilized Life," *Mental Hygiene* 18, no. 1, Jan. 1934, p. 51.
3. Ibid., p. 52
4. Kimball Young, "Freedom, Responsibility and Self-Control," *Mental Hygiene* 21, no. 2, April 1937, p. 177.
5. Ibid., p. 178.
6. Margaret Powell, "Activity and the Mental Hygiene Program," *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 7, no. 9, Nov. 1936, p. 556.

What is the Meaning of the Noun Education?

Learning is the first and most lasting outcome of the physical education experience. Through movement, one develops understanding of oneself and one's world. One learns values and experiences beauty. One has fun. Physical education offers honesty and excellence to persons of widely differing abilities.

But to be truly educational, the physical education experience must provide opportunities for reflective thinking and allow for the intellectualizing of abstractions. This is one of the significant criteria by which the educational value in any phase of a physical education program can be judged.

There are some who believe that there is no thinking involved in movement. You just move—it happens. They assume that students are taught, not to meet and solve problems, but to set into motion a series of reflexes that enable them, after wondrous arobatic convolutions, to land on their feet rather than on their faces. Participation in a game is seen not as a series of strategies planned and difficulties solved but as a group of players jumping to the will of the coach who does all of the thinking while the students do the playing. Modern dance is seen as something for which the teacher chooses the music, does the choreography, determines the theme, prescribes the costumes and design, and "puts dancers through their paces."

Passages from an address delivered at the 50th anniversary celebration of the founding of the School of Physical Education at the University of Oregon, Seattle, Washington, April 3, 1970.

There are places, even today, where this picture of nonthinking is not overdrawn. Some teachers work out the "day's order" the night before, planning every minute of every hour. The resulting activities involve the individual very little in thinking—what thinking does occur deals with attitudes toward the activity. Students can be found dashing from station to station as they circuit train at a teacher-determined cadence and whistle-punctuated intervals. We have scores of teachers, coaches, athletic or "physical" directors, who believe they can solve problems better than can the people they teach. This grand larceny, this theft of the right to think makes mockery of everything we know of education.

This unfortunate tradition of nonthinking in movement is old and deep-rooted. To assume that arriving at the sum of one plus one requires thought that counting ten push-ups cannot require is the height of absurdity. "Bodies" are supposed to be "trained." "Fitness" is supposed to be developed. The reflexes are supposed to take over when "activity" is learned. Such assumptions remind us of Dewey's caustic description: "The inert, stupid quality of current customs perverts learning into a willingness to follow where others point the way, into conformity, constriction, surrender of skepticism and experiment. . . . We think of the insolent coercions, the insinuating briberies, the pedagogic solemnities by which the freshness of youth can be faded and its vivid curiosities dulled. Education becomes the art of taking advantage of the helplessness of the young."[1]

Our discipline is called *physical education,* and the noun is as important as the adjective. The adjective—*physical*—describes the means. The noun—*education*—tells what happens. Physical education means that someone is educated; to be educated means to be able to think; to develop the ability to think we must give people the opportunity to think. This means that they will weigh values, make choices, solve problems, reckon with consequences, plan a course of action, test hypotheses, arrive at conclusions, and come to decisions. Any other kind of "educational experience" is peripheral. To judge the educational value of any experience properly, one must evaluate the total experience—the performance itself, the events and decisions leading up to the performance, the choices made during the performance, and the conclusion derived from the performance which may be useful in future situations. When movement is viewed in such a context, it has meaning. Let us examine one aspect of physical education experience by way of illustration.

Disputes are inevitable in the course of a semester or season in physical education. Perhaps the game situation and the basic character of play bring them about. How are they settled? Obviously, there are various ways. They can be settled by fists or loud voices, by outtalking, outyelling, or outfighting—methods of passion, not of reason, that support might and require strength rather than sense.

One step above that level is to rely on rules. Rules are the crystallization of past experience. We have learned ways by which the activity goes best and have put them into rules. When an argument comes up, we consult the rules, we analyze our interpretation, and the dispute can be settled. This involves more sense than strength.

But there is still a higher level of adjusting matters. The parties involved, with time, patience, and some regard for each other's interests, should be willing to think through the disputed situation, see new elements in it, weigh the values involved, and come to a decision in terms of this particular, and perhaps novel, set of circumstances.

An interesting illustration of this possibility will be found in the story of a tournament basketball game in which the winner was awarded a one-point victory even though the referee had himself shot the one point! It came about this way: In the final quarter of a game in a tournament that meant quite a bit to the teams and the communities, a one-shot foul was called on A. When B stepped up to shoot the foul, the referee noticed the net was caught on the rim. Taking the ball, the referee flipped it through the basket, disengaging the net. The scorekeeper looked up just in time to see the ball coming down through the net and, thinking a point had been scored, marked it to the credit of B. Actually, the referee had shot the point and B had not. The mistake was not discovered until the final few minutes, and after the game A's team protested. The referee, however, signed the scorebook with the false score and did not ask the teams to resume play in an overtime period. From then on the situation became tense. A wanted B to play the game over, or at least the last quarter. B refused. Townspeople became involved; people took sides. The great question was, did B win or was the game a tie? The facts were clear that both teams had scored 34 points and the referee had scored one point, which had been credited to B.

Now suppose students had shared in the decision on the protest. Would not a situation of this sort be an excellent chance to allow students to do some real and vital thinking? Perhaps an assembly could be called, at which time both sides of the issue could be aired. It could be pointed out in support of keeping the game that—

1. The scoreboard showing a point advantage in those last few minutes, a different strategy was used from the one that would have been in order if the score had been tied.
2. The game was over and the official said B had won. That is what officials are for and their decisions are final.
3. There would be no time to play the game over before the next tournament.
4. The Commissioner had sustained the fact that the game was legally over and that B was legally the winner.

On the other side it could be argued that:

1. B had not won. The score was really A-34, B-34, Referee-1.
2. To take the game was to take something that morally did not belong to B.
3. Despite all the rules and official judgments, the generous and courteous thing to do would have been to play some, if not all, of the game over.
4. No matter what decisions are made, no one will ever believe that B won the game.
5. How would B feel about it if the tables were turned?

If these and other arguments had been presented, the students could have held a referendum. After thorough discussion a vote could have been taken in which the players and the student body alike could have been asked to decide:

1. Shall the decision awarding the game to B stand?
2. Shall part of the game be played over?
3. Shall all of the game be played over?
4. Shall the game be ruled a tie?

It would have been interesting to see what the student reaction would have been (a) to the debate and discussion and (b) to the opportunity to vote on such a matter. Actually, such decisions are so rarely left to the students and are so frequently settled peremptorily by adults that one wonders how the chance for enhancing the educational content of athletics can be so completely missed. Surely, if we are going to teach, we must encourage decision making. The student must be given a chance to judge, to weigh, to evaluate, to test his own powers of thinking.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that thinking is the process through which meanings are developed and tested by firsthand experience in problem solving, one must not ignore still another opportunity to make a contribution to intellectual development through the physical education experience. Many movement patterns permit the individual to develop nonverbal abstractions and relationships involving time, space, force, design, and form. Such involvement calls for study, thought, and analysis. It calls for the discernment of relationships and the creation of meanings and represents an acceptable form of creative intelligence at work. It is obvious that dance makes use of such opportunities, but it is possible for this to occur in other activities as well. When people are encouraged to solve their own problems of movement, many exciting and wonderful things happen.

To solve problems; to reflect on past experiences; to reckon with consequences; to understand relationships; to act independently; to plan a course of action; to undertake a project; to synthesize, summarize, and conclude—these things characterize learning and reflective thinking. It is the job of the physical education teacher to provide students liberally with opportunities to engage in these processes rather than do the thinking for them. This principle applies to all forms of teaching, from elementary school activity to intercollegiate athletics. The more the student is involved, the more educational the activity tends to be. Thinking is not just talking, it is not just reviewing last Saturday's film in a "skull session"—it is the involvement of the total individual in a process that makes demands of his or her ability to reason.

If, as a regular part of the physical education program, students are allowed to share the planning of the day-to-day experience; if discussion is held on better ways of doing things; if conduct is appraised for its consequences; if issues are made a part of class understanding; if the day's work is consecutive in relation to a larger project and does not insult the intelligence of students by asking them to change their direction every five minutes or by giving them drills that require a minimum of thought, then there is educational value in the program.

This principle poses a serious problem for modern athletic programs, particularly the games of baseball, basketball, and football. The coach flashes the signals, calls the pitch, tells the batter where to hit, directs the running of bases, sends in a play with every down, calls the defense strategy from the bench, sets up the playing combinations. If coaches did not do this, the game would surely be less than perfect. But we want nearly perfect play because we want victory, and for this we pay a heavy price—the player is denied the opportunity to learn many of the finer points of the game and, more important, is denied the right to make decisions, test his or her judgment, and thus *learn*. The more the adult control, the greater the depreciation of educational value. A wise plan to put coaches together in the stands during the game, and thus give the game back to the players, has been ignored. Yet, player control of the game has great merit and is surely worth a try.

One of the aims of education is to give learners such control over the methods of living in society that they will become increasingly independent of instruction. This means that teaching should be done so well that students can quickly learn to be self-directing and self-propelling. Students should be given a chance to think and act without constant suggestion, correction, planning, and directing from the teacher. One can no more overlook the necessity for cultivating skill in thinking through physical education than one would overlook the development of organic integrity. The whole person constantly confronts us.

Is it ethical for some to use the term *physical education* to describe what they do, when so many of them have only a vague idea of what the word *education* means and really could not care less? I believe that the term *physical education* has great and significant meaning. I thought that it was understood by all my colleagues and coworkers and that our programs were evolving clearly in the directions American education was, and is, taking. But I was mistaken. We got just so far and then stopped and, in some places turned back. There remain today only a few thousand among us who, without an ounce of deception, can face the world as *educators* using the experiences from the motor world of gymnasium, pool, and camp as the *means* for educational development. All others have fallen back, either intimidated or enchanted by the draculian dichotomy of "physical" fitness. Or they find it comfortable not to *educate* in any dynamic and planned way but to seek comfort in the sleezy arms of that old mistress whose coat for those arms has embroidered across it that horrendous cliche about the sound body housing the sound mind. This is the babysitter's view of physical education.

All we have to do is provide a safe refuge for the mind—and it is the only thing that counts. So we exercise our kids. God, how we exercise them and drill them and wave their arms and bend their torsos and bark at them and test them! Back comes the gymnasium full of apparatus, back from oblivion comes physical training, back from limbo comes the drillmaster with his perspirometer to measure response to his silly commands.

We tried but we didn't quite make it—at least a lot of us didn't—and we still unethically call the resultant hodge-podge a program of physical *education*. They are not educators; they are conditioners. The "good workout" is their stock in trade and the performance and/or score of the ballgame their most popular evaluative devices. These people still call themselves physical educators. They are not. They are physical trainers, like dog trainers or horse trainers or exercise boys for horses, or they are professional entrepreneurs whose only concern is with the "gate," the championship, or the perfection of the skill.

Why this blast? Because insofar as my own human frailty will permit me, I detest unethical practice, and when a man or woman calls himself an *educator*, particularly a physical educator, then I insist he know what education is, what the goals of education are in this society, how the educational process works best, the relation of education to thinking, and in short, wherein lies learning. The noun *education* is more important than the adjective *physical*. The latter merely implies the means, the media, through which we educate.

This is an old argument in our field, and maybe we are at the stage now where we ought to resolve it. Maybe we ought to stand up and be counted. Maybe the time has come to separate into two camps—the educators and the trainers. I have nothing against physical conditioning. It is great for those who need it. It can be good therapy—even good development. Call it physical conditioning. Call it physical exercise. Call it anything you want. But don't call it physical education. There may not be room for both in American education. Let us identify the differences by identifying the characteristics of *education* and then finding out what dance or the trampoline or camping or tennis or conditioning exercises have to do with it. And let us solve this major ethical problem by being honest in our declaration of purpose.

NOTE

1. John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1922), p. 64.

A Test for Educational Value

One cannot be sure, always, of the educational value of any given physical education program. The organic or physical values may be clear enough. In fact many and varied values may be recognized. But how can we be sure of "educational" values?

A returning graduate student is asked how the year went. "Fine," he says. "Took my basketball team to the quarter finals in the district." There's a value. Games won and lost. Championships. Scores. Or he may report a successful year because of the addition of two new tennis courts or some new gear for the gymnasium. Another value. Facilities, equipment, space. And others may add a year to the requirement, or an hour to the weekly schedule, or a class in health to go along with the activities program—curriculum expansion, valuable of course, and a mark of progress. No curriculum such as that operated by well prepared physical education teachers can be judged properly by any single standard. All of the foregoing are significant in their relation to the aims of the program as a whole.

But what is physical education for? What are we trying to do in physical education? That is always a potent question—embarrassing to many who are either not sure of their ends or who, when their ends are stated, find them at variance with the goals of education. The scholar in physical education, in contrast to the meet-your-class blow-your-whistle give-'em-a-workout teacher, is willing to ponder the question and to study his program in relation to criteria which have been derived from the purposes of American education.

Published in *The Progressive Physical Education* 31: 5-7; December 1948.

For it has been one of the most fortuitous accidents that physical education programs are found in schools and colleges. They might have been found only in community centers, YMCA's or athletic clubs, or in churches. Physical training was introduced originally in education as a body-building enterprise and as a means of discipline under the naive belief that young people needed "a sound mind in a sound body." But when a few began to see the necessity of cultivating the educational values in the program in order to remain in the educational structure it became a struggle against the "forces of reaction" who held to the old faculty psychology. Programs were to be judged by precision, sweat, and numbers and not by anything that smacks of the allegedly "softer" educational value.

And so it is with many today. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Tangible results must be shown! If you can't win games you are no good as a teacher. If the fitness scores do not rise sharper on the chart, then the program needs toughening up. If you don't have them march a little what kind of discipline can you get? And what we really need is a five-hour-a-week program every year so we can point with pride to the numbers we serve!

There *must* be clearer, more productive criteria—values that will stand the test of the 20th century, that have some bearing upon an *educated* life. Let us mention some of these and hold them up as value which, when found within a program, give assurance that *here* is education:

1. *A sense of respect for human personality.* Need this be described? It lies at the root of American life. It is one of our great beliefs. We basically hold human life in dignity and honor, and we must continue to do so if democracy is to survive. Where better to teach this than on the playfield? It is the glory of sport. To know, to honor, to enjoy the competitor and to hold him neither in contempt nor in indifference—these make the sport experience contributory to the furtherance of our way of life. It is the rankest of falsehood to teach that to be friendly with the opponent is to "soften" when the "heat is on." Pure rubbish. The best of friends can do battle on the field of play with no less heat than those who have been taught hate or contempt.

2. *A sense of morality.* Can we teach our children to do something for its inherent value alone—without thought of reward or recognition? Do we need a letter or a bet to be won or lost for every game? Do we need for every dance a picture in the paper or a write-up in the college annual? There is reason to believe we can, but the drift is surely the other way—at least in competitive sport. Maybe that's why mountain climbers, fishermen, skiers and sailors look with pity upon the football star. They feel he may be deluded by glories unreal and knows not where the great values of sport are to be found. Does he? Is there anything about football that would deny him inherent satisfactions? Or is it only

in the way it is taught that football can become such a delusion and a fake? Physical education can be best taught when its students learn the quiet pleasures derived from doing something for values *inherent* in it. Thus they become discriminating and know the real from the false. Thus they cultivate a sense of morality.

3. *A sense of courtesy*. The cynic would say, "Let's have none of this sweet courtesy. This is an age of bad manners, of retaliation, of loud talk and raucous laughter. Let's have none of the business of fair play." And yet this world of ours still holds a place for the gentleman and the gentlewoman. Courtesy, like chivalry, is not yet dead. There remains something fine about giving the opponent—the visitor—his choice of goals, or of inviting the visitors to a party after the game. A round of applause for the opponents' good play, an understanding that the competitor is human, too—those things can be taught, and when they are physical education is good. To teach children to be unselfish, less self-assertive, less abusive of others is an obligation and an opportunity in physical education.

4. *Reaching the student where he lives*. This is not too much to ask of physical education. Experiences within the program must touch the heart and soul of kids to make them a little better than they are. To give them a lift toward a better adjustment to an already tough life. To give them some inner pleasure and warmth and confidence. Pure sentiment? Perhaps, and a strange way to be judging the effectiveness of physical education! But the rag-tag who caught a smile from the "gym" teacher and lived for months on its nourishment is as important an "outcome" as the team that went to the quarter finals. And so is the amputee who came back in the swing of normal life because his physical education teacher gave him confidence and a good golf stroke. Why cannot the physical education teacher take 200 in a class and "exercise" them all at once? He can, but he cannot *educate* them under those conditions for the same reason no other teacher can. The outcomes are more personal in terms of individual growth, in terms of the child himself, and not found merely in his muscles.

5. *A sense of objectivity and extroversion*. What joy it is to talk with someone who is wholly unselfish, thoughtless of himself, modest, self-effacing and unassuming. Such virtues! Can they be taught? Is it possible to place the learning child in situations where his attention is on some ulterior purpose and not on himself alone? If an outcome of experience in physical education is an honest objectivity, a desirable outward turning of the consciousness, then we are making a real contribution to the normal adjustment of children. But from some of our activities, taught in typical ways, comes only selfconsciousness and introspective worry and boasting. There he stands, like the Zulu warrior, for all the world to admire. Still flexing his muscles, doing giant swings, and telling about his prowess! Physical education should lead people gently by the hand *out* of themselves into the fresher world of other affairs.

6. *A capacity for reflective thinking.* Here is an outcome more important than many of the others. In educational circles the premium is upon the intelligence. Like it or not, man still survives because he thinks. Schools and colleges devote themselves to the cultivation of the intellect. To the end that that means dualism—a belief in the separation of mind from body—it is spurious and iniquitous. But to the extent it challenges physical education to produce thinking people (and not just dumb athletes obediently following telephonic orders from coaches high on the roof of the stadium, or sweaty gymnasts whose principal intellectual effort is the decision as to when to use the chalk on his hands), it is a valid emphasis. Our games and dances must be so taught as to allow students a chance to think, to weigh values, to ponder consequences, to relate previous experiences, to seek solutions. To reflect. There is little such involved in marching tactics or the forward roll. And not much more in modern collegiate football. And by the absence or presence of opportunities for reflective thinking may a program be judged educational.

7. *An integrating relationship with the rest of the curriculum.* An elementary grade was studying England in their "core." The physical education teachers helped by teaching them English dances, providing material on English sports, discussing the English origins of our concept of amateurism, and explaining the Olympic games. All of which knit physical education more closely to the rest of the curriculum experience. Off by itself in the basement gymnasium, physical education has little opportunity to make such contributions. But in some schools it can.

8. *And skill.* With all the foregoing we must never forget the importance of skill. The know-how. The ability. A program can be judged in part by looking at the effort the teacher puts into the teaching of skill. The physical education period is no play period. It is not for intramurals. It is no place to loaf. It is a place to learn, to practice, to teach. Skill in performance, up to the level of enjoyment at least, is a basic element need, and no amount of glossing over by citation of some of the other values will cover a fundamental weakness if the students are not skilled. To teach them to *do* is to give the means, the instrument by which these other values may accrue.

Appraisal, evaluation may be done in those terms or in others. There are others easier to use. Credits, for example, or the percentage of participants in the intramural program. Those are all significant. When added up an estimate of the program may be had. If it is physical *education* we are teaching then evaluation must also be done in *educational* terms. And that means an appraisal of the effect of the physical education experience on the expanding personality of the developing student. What *good* does it do him?

The Role of Physical Education in Health and Fitness

So far in the 20th century there have been four distinct periods of intensified interest in the role of physical education in fitness. We are today in the fourth discernible period. Theodore Roosevelt started the first one when he publicly advocated the vigorous life as a way of making our nation strong. The second was caused by the revelations of the physical examinations in World War I, which shocked legislators to the point where some 27 states passed laws in the succeeding ten years requiring that physical education be taught in schools as a way of improving the vigor of our youth. World War II brought the third national effort to improve physical fitness of the general as well as the school public. Those of us who were tapped for this sort of civilian service will remember that we were directed to rope off streets and by using available firemen and policemen lead the public in a program of exercises aimed at improving the fiber of the embattled American. And now for the fourth time in this century a wave of interest is felt. It is marked by Presidential citations of need and by extraordinary efforts from the Capitol to persuade communities to improve the fitness of youth by developing strong programs of health education and physical education including a recommended daily 15-minute period of vigorous exercises.

Delivered to a joint session of the American School Health Association and the Food and Nutrition, Maternal and Child Health, and School Health sections of the American Public Health Association at the 89th annual meeting, Detroit, November 14, 1961.

Published in *American Journal of Public Health* 52: 1155-60; July 1962.

Historically, such developments have occurred before. At various times when nations have faced perils, either real or imaginary, efforts have been made to improve the fitness of youth as an important part of the solution to the problem. Programs of physical training in 19th-century Germany and Sweden and in 20th-century Italy, Germany, and Russia have been used for national purposes in support of political or social ideologies. Youth has been captured in every instance and drilled, exercised, and strengthened to support the beneficent system and, more importantly, to protect that system against its enemies.

So it is with us. Undoubtedly, we need a strong populace for either a warm peace or the cold war. To guard the health of the nation is a worthy ambition no matter what our destiny may be. To control disease, to improve nutrition, to prevent mental and nervous diseases, to seek emotional, social, and intellectual stability, and to secure appropriate growth and development of children and youth become almost an abiding national passion. We are committed to such effort and enthusiastically so. Our form of political life not only requires a nation of healthy citizens, but guarantees them the right to be healthy.

But whenever we go through one of these periods of greater interest in fitness, we should at least be in possession of an accurate picture of need in order to develop a true program in response. We should be able to distinguish fact from fiction in both areas of need and program. How is it today?

Some people have developed a test of muscular strength and flexibility of the spine, given it to several thousand children here and abroad, find our youth comparing unfavorably with Europeans or Japanese or whoever, and have immediately concluded (a) that our children, in fact all of us, are weak and flabby, (b) that our technological culture is destructive of our capacity for survival, and (c) if we do not do something about it we will lose the cold war. This position, widely advertised in the popular press, has created quite a national stir.

So once again programs of physical education are asked to step up the intensity of their purpose and the vigor of their content in order to save youth, and thus our country, from desuetude, if not actual destruction! We have reemphasized an atrociously unscientific but popular term "physical fitness," and we are being told that our children are woefully deficient in it. It is alarming in more ways than one, because it is not a situation marked by clear fact, clear need, and clear response. In fact there is a great confusion in all three categories—of fact, of need, and of response or program.

For example, does one equate the sound advice and factual information of scientists in the area of child growth and development, or of pediatricans, with the television personality who advocates the criss-cross leg exercise for infants three months old? Does one equate the scientific papers appearing in the collection from the Institute of Normal Human Anatomy meeting in Rome in 1960, and bearing the imprint of such international names as Larson, Hollmann, Simon, Wolffe, Jokl, Missuro, and the others who contributed, with the prattle of those who run the exercise emporiums for money and who are advertised as our greatest physical educators? Does one equate the sound advice on exercise coming from exercise physiologists such as Karpovich, Steinhaus, or Mayer with opportunistic entrepreneurs who would not know the myocardium from oxygen debt?

But we wander. Our problem is: What is the role of physical education in health and fitness? Let me see if my version of the answer comes anywhere near your version.

In the first place the need for activity on the part of the human organism has been well established. Documentation of this is unnecessary. The evidence is clear. Man is an active creature and activity is important to his growth, development, and survival. The need for exercise is here to stay.

But apparently nature does not care a bit how one gets the activity needed. The "form" the activity takes is biologically unimportant as long as no harm is done. Run around the block, play football, dance a jig, or go climb a telephone pole. The heart does not care. Muscle does not care. The rectus abdominus, which is a pretty important muscle in maintaining visceral order against visceral chaos does not care whether it is used in basketball, bowling, or burglary as long as it is used. If muscular strength is what we are after to correct the evil ways into which we have fallen, nature does not care how we get it—or at what price. Strength-building activities can be anything that builds strength—and thus they need to have no other purpose, no other meaning, no discernible relationship to anything significant except strength itself.

I am afraid this is the sort of thing that some are calling "physical" fitness—a sort of muscular development that comes from exercise and that can be used for any purpose at the discretion of the possessor.

In these terms there would be relatively few problems involved in making the nation muscularly strong. Just set 40 million school children to exercising with sufficient vigor and keep them at it and we will accomplish our objective!

There are only two things wrong with this concept: Exercise is only partially responsible for fitness, and strength is only one of the concerns of physical education.

Our scientists, our philosophers, our educators, the better informed physical educators, and even our poets have proclaimed that there is more to fitness than muscle strength. A conference of such people in 1956 described fitness as "that state which characterizes the degree to which the person is able to function." [1] It implies the ability of each person to develop most effectively his potentialities. And the conference agreed that fitness is maintained at a high level only if motivation is continuously present! This requires an inner desire—an egogenic stimulation. The activities that produce fitness must have meaning! The conference listed seven components of fitness, all of which are related to each other and are mutually interdependent. These are—

1. Optimum organic health consistent with heredity and the application of present health knowledge.
2. Sufficient coordination, strength, and vitality to meet emergencies, as well as the requirements of daily living.
3. Emotional stability to meet the stresses and strains of modern life.
4. Social consciousness and adaptability with respect to the requirements of group living.
5. Sufficient knowledge and insight to make suitable decisions and arrive at feasible solutions to problems.
6. Attitudes, values, and skills which stimulate satisfactory participation in a full range of daily activities.
7. Spiritual and moral qualities which contribute the fullest measure of living in a democratic society.

Now what does physical education have to do with fitness as described in those terms? Well, the relationship to all seven is the only thing that makes physical education physical "education." Otherwise it would be physical training—and there is a vast and uncomfortable difference between the two!

In the somewhat peculiar and not clearly understood combination of words *physical education*, the noun *education* becomes of great importance. It is not the same thing as training—physical training. Physical training trains, just as you train a dog or a pony. Kelley and Rasey say:

> Much of our education is designed to train people rather than to educate them. When one individual trains another, he delimits the variety of possible responses, making the desired responses automatic and eliminating the possibility of other responses. We can train lower animals, but we cannot educate them. Training, limiting possible responses, is enslaving, while education is liberating. It is not that one is trained not to think, but that the act of training by its very nature delimits thinking. In the degree that the individual thus trained does think, he has been robbed of confidence in his own thinking.[2]

But physical education implies that someone, somehow, is being educated, through the games, sports, and dance culturally important to our race (and it is important to know the difference).

To educate means to enrich the capacities of human intelligence. It means to help the individual gain increasing possession of himself and his powers; it means to recapitulate his culture, to deepen and widen its social content, to give him control over the methods of living within that culture. Some would say that the essence of education is the development of intelligence, of powers of thought, of the capacity for reflection, of human reason. The task of education is to develop the fullest capacity to take thought, to reflect, to weigh, to foresee, to consider consequences, to choose among alternatives. There may be other descriptions of education, but in the main they all describe a relationship between the learner and his environment in which the former is assisted to gain some personal control over and understanding of the latter by the cultivation of powers inherent within him. This is to make him fit in the terms the conference described. He learns to do this. He cannot do it as a child and as life goes on he develops his powers to the point where he can. Hullfish adds this thought:

> The term learning may then be applied to any process within which potential stimuli become meaningful, change meaning, are discriminated with respect to possible meaning, and the like.[3]

If we view meanings as the basic building blocks of learning, then any event that results in a reconstruction or reorganization of a meaning pattern may be called a learning experience. Any experience, then, which in consequence of its meaningfulness "increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" may be called an educative experience.

Now if physical education means that someone is educated through or by the "physical" experience, or in a "physical" environment, then the experience should be productive of the qualities described in the definitions. Can this happen? Does this happen? By accident or by design? Maybe it is that no education at all takes place through the physical education experience, at least in these terms. Perhaps this is not what the term *physical education* is meant to imply. Perhaps the only relation physical education has to education is that experience in physical education so conditions the organism that it can receive the stimuli that permits the student to become educated! This is the idea of the sound body in which to house the sound "mind." This is the ancient dichotomous view. This belies man's unity. To many persons in physical education and to many from other fields, other values from the physical education experience all loom larger and more important than the educational ones. Physical values come first—educational values a poor second, and only if something good happens to come along.

It should be clear, however, that if that point of view is held then it is hypocritical to use the term *physical education*. The term should be *physical training*, or *physical exercise*, or some other to describe what is happening. If *education* is the noun used, then a clear, reasonable, and demonstrable relationship to its substance must be developed in the physical education curricula. Someone must be educated. Educational outcomes must be sought, planned for, taught for, and obtained. They must be of prime concern, not secondary or incidental within a physical education program.

What kinds of outcomes could be considered educational? The answer is inherent in the question. Only those experiences that demand thinking will produce thinking? Only that kind of participation that requires the student to weigh, to reflect, to study will produce those qualities. It will not be likely that they will be produced by the kind of activity in which the participating individual does not become involved in some problem requiring solving, evaluating, thinking. Can a team have the chance to solve some of its own problems, or must the coach always direct the strategy, call the plays? Can a class become involved in seeking desirable outcomes from their work? Is social, religious, racial integration of consequence to students? What responses can be developed to cheating at games, sportsmanship, values in athletics, and to appreciation of good play?

Experience in a well conceived physical education program can aid in the solution of such problems. The understanding of integrative processes and the relationship of the physiological, psychological, and other functional elements to development can be enhanced through physical education. Comprehension of strength, ability, courage, daring, and skill can be developed. One makes progress in the solution of such developmental tasks as achieving skill in motor control and coordination, independence in self-care, learning to live in groups, and in relation to competitors.

An analysis of the effects of these experiences from physical education relate directly to the stated components of fitness, and this kind of physical education has an important relation to fitness and health.

But let us go one step further. There is perhaps no more compelling problem facing our educational system than that of deepening and widening our understanding of democracy. It has been said that our young people must be physically, mentally, and spiritually prepared for American citizenship.

How do you go about developing these qualities? By marching, drilling, exercising in groups and mobs under the impersonal supervision of an authoritarian drillmaster who counts the numbers while the victims pray they may be spared further boredom and when released from it vow never to have anything to do with physical exercise the rest of their lives? This is hardly a satisfying experience in adaptability to group living, hardly productive of the spiritual and moral qualities needed to live successfully in a democracy! This sort of thing may temporarily produce some muscular strength but it is also very likely to produce emotional and perhaps even spiritual trauma.

To preserve the democratic way, to bring the oncoming generations into a clear understanding of its meaning, to develop a deep and unmistakable sensitivity to what democracy really is—this is a compelling challenge. The program of physical education cannot afford to be caught napping in this respect, nor can it be found guilty of teaching by precept or practice the ways of behaving and thinking that are characteristic of authoritarian regimes.

We have said that schools in general and physical education programs in particular have always been used as instruments of political and social power. One shudders at the memory of the marching Hitler youth—fit, strong, singing their way through exercises and sports so they could better reflect the marching ruthlessness of the most inhuman regime the 20th century has known.

What social and political purpose then does 20th century American physical education serve? It cannot be culturally neutral. Opportunities abound in the physical education program to provide experience with democratic processes. It should be clearly said and clearly understood that as long as physical education remains an element in the curriculum of a school or college that is dedicated to the perpetuation of the democratic way no teaching or administrative practice may, with conscience, demonstrate other and contrary values. The autocratic empirical administrator is as bad as the authoritarian teacher or coach. Each is a menace, in his or her own way, to the planned intellectualized approach to the perpetuation of democracy through the schools.

In some programs the students all wear the same kind of uniform, go through the same exercises, count the same cadence as they march, respond with the same imposed replies, affect the same posturing as they go through their exercises. They conform. The standard is set. The motive comes from outside, from above. It takes no intellectual response to "count-off" and to wave one's arms about in a calisthenic drill aimed at "physical condition."

It does, however, require self-initiated intellectual response to figure out the strategy of a game and execute it, or to compose a dance, or to plot the course for an overnight hike. It requires self-initiated activity to practice what one has been shown on how to swim or how to kick a soccer ball. This type of activity must come from within and be willingly chosen as a rewarding experience. This sort of activity is within the cultural tradition of a free people.

The opportunity is here. Modern physical education can serve as an educative experience or it can frankly and honorably renounce its claims to education and direct its energies to producing the sound body in which to house the sound mind. There is something pathetically unscientific about that effort but there is nothing dishonorable in it—except that it must not use the term *physical education*.

But to seek the integrative development of the whole man, to be as concerned with his ethics as with his physiology, to be helpful in his interpretations of motives, to aid him in his understanding of human nature, to help explore those deep wells of yearning within himself, to help him see that excellence is not measured wholly by scores—these are some of the other outcomes within the reach of a well planned physical education curriculum.

And so we, at any rate, believe the role of physical education in health and fitness is clear—and important. It is indispensable to both. Physical training, on the other hand, or merely muscle exercises for strength alone may, paradoxically, be destructive of the many things they are designed to help. By their sheer meaninglessness and potential for boredom, and because they are almost invariably terminal experiences, and because they offer no intrinsic appeal, they may be so regarded by the self-directing individual to drive him away from any desire to be fit or from any practice that may contribute to his fitness.

We must be careful, not merely enthusiastic. Not just any activity as long as it produces sweat and strength is educative in the rational interpretation of that word. From modern physical education programs we expect lasting values in continuous participation—an accumulation of "fitness scores" is not only insignificant compared to this but may actually be defeating this goal.

NOTES

1. "AAHPER Fitness Conference," *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 27, no. 6, Sept. 1956, p. 8.
2. Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Rasey, *Education and the Nature of Man* (New York: Harper, 1952), p. 106.
3. H. Gordon Hullfish and Philip G. Smith, *Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1961).

On Learning Values Through Sport

Now, no fair peeking! And thus came to us the first admonition to assure our conformity to the standards of conduct with which games have been played in our land. We were not supposed to peek! Anyone should know that. The game—what was it?——ten steps or hide-and-go-seek—presumed a code of honor mandatory upon us from the first instant we heard the rules. There were to be no exceptions. One simply did not entertain the idea of cheating. One went full-out for one's own honor and later for the honor of one's own school. After all, there were only two fates worse than death, and one was to be caught cheating at games!

With some reason, one might believe that this successful transmission of acceptable or traditional ethical values has been one of the reassuring and remarkable phenomena of our age. One comes to games, whether stickball in Manhattan or duck-on-the-rock in Grand Island, with the understanding that there is a way of doing this, and one would not, either as a matter of principle or for self-preservative reasons, be one to violate the code. "Play fair," "give him his turn," "I moved my ball in the rough," "I touched the channel marker with the tip of my boom," have become the confessions or commands heard by all and sundry as the standards of gentle folk have been transmitted through the games and sports of our people.

Games have thus been touched with a deserved halo of honor. They have become significant in life as experiences a bit different from the market place.

Published in *Quest*, December 1963, pp. 23-29.

When once the gladiator (or marbleshooter, or rope-skipper, or tennis player) sets foot on the field of play the count is assumed to be correct. The "call" will be without favor or advantage, the chips will fall where they will, and if he loses because of the inexorable forces at work he will withhold his tears and his alibi, acknowledge the superiority of his opponent, and later, join him in a toast and song to the happy days of friendly contest!

Not yet has the cynicism of "nice guys finish last" penetrated *all* of sport and destroyed its virtue. Not yet has the sportsman who plays with honor and with respect in his heart for the traditions of the game and the rights of the opponent disappeared from the scene.

But almost. Games and sports are rapidly losing their simplicity of former days. They command now the attention of millions—of people and dollars. Fortunes are made from them. Reputations built or ruined. The sporting goods industry grosses within the top ten. Organized athletics in schools and communities have moved from the simple pleasures of a Yale-Harvard boat race to the spectacles of Canton-Massillon or the Cotton Bowl. Much is at stake—including the quality of morality that pervades the phenomenon.

And there is cause for alarm. No longer are all the games played on the high plane of respectability. There has crept into the program elements of immorality and greed which bid fair to spoil the fun. And it will take more effort on the part of many people to stem the tide of anti-morality and anti-intellectualism which is presently engulfing sport as it is engulfing many other aspects of our cultural, political, and social existence.

Organized effort? Teach ethics—or morality—by organized effort? Well, let's examine the case for it.

How have any of us arrived at our present level of ethical behavior? How have we achieved the values we live by? Mainly by observing example and partly by responding to teaching and the force of law. We can remember being good boys and girls long enough in Sunday school to reflect upon the startling news that "blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." So we were somewhat perplexed and shocked a little when the noted sports authority, Mr. Durocher, was quoted as saying that "nice guys finish last."

Nor can we fail to be impressed with Norman Cousins when he points out how casually we regard violence, whether it be in games, traffic, or war, and shows us how we completely repudiate the admonition to turn the other cheek or to love one's enemies in such situations.

It is going to take organized effort because of the great and powerful influences at work today bringing games and sports to their knees in a brutal assault to turn them into instruments not useful for perpetuating the gentle skills of friendly intercourse. They now can be powerful media for greed, bribery, and perhaps worst of all the dominating egocentrism of him who would use others not as Kant would have them used—as ends withal—but through the particularly immoral exploitation for ends which are *not* their own. In some quarters, if we hunger and thirst after righteousness it is becoming a little more difficult to be filled.

The case, as I see it, is alarming. Charlie, my neighboring twelve-year-old, is ready with his alibi if he loses a bike race. He must save face. It does not dawn on him that Benny may have been faster. Parents in Little League and high school sport are becoming notoriously poor sports. The coaching from the bench (distinctly against the rules) in big-time football influences thousands in little-time football. A midwestern college athletic director and president *knew* of an All-American's scholastic ineligibility his sophomore year but by duplicity he continued to play until his eligibility was used up two years later! The cynicism of players, coaches, commissioners, and newsmen associated with tournaments and championships invariably increases in volume as the gate swells and the audience enlarges. "Amateur" college athletics have all but disappeared, leaving only the tears of a lamented Whitney Griswold or an irate Lewis Morrill. Bowl games multiply. To deny one leads to a display of bad temper on the part of the aggrieved press, alumni, and students whose ethical standards are no higher than will allow them to throw bottles through the windows of the building where the faculty had voted to deny the darlings a chance to win—and thus gloat.

It is not a pretty picture.

But it ought not be surprising that it is not pretty. Because the decline in morality in sports, the abandonment of those sweet virtues of our polite childhood, are all related to the major transition taking place in the character of our culture.

Richard Hofstadter, in that realistic tome *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*,[1] traces this disease through our religious institutions, our politics, business, and education. He traces the beginning of the decline of the respect for the gentleman to the attacks on Thomas Jefferson, and he makes it clear that the learned man or woman, the nobleman and his principles of conduct, the gentility of the aristocrat has given way to standards of the mob and the slob. None of us has escaped, and some of us are bruised from this tidal wave of anti-intellectualism and anti-morality which holds our schools suspect of everything from the teaching of the doctrine of racial equality (of all things) to dealing realistically with the true nature of the democratic process!

To stem this tide is the greatest challenge confronting us all in education—and surely it confronts us in physical education. Where better than on the playing fields and in the gymnasiums of our schools and colleges can we demonstrate and evaluate the dynamics of ethical judgment? Our rules of the games *do not* and *cannot* govern human conduct completely. Any more than can legislation guarantee equality of opportunity among men. As Martin Buber would put it, the demands of authentic existence mean that man cannot blindly follow the prescripts of law but must accept an "ethic of responsibility," in which moral action is a response to what the situation demands at a given time.

I wonder, for example, if we have not misread completely the "competitive spirit" as it flows so brightly in our culture. Competition has made us great—competition with nations, with nature, and with our fellow man. But we seem to have confused the uses of competition as between war and sport. To be sure of it we frequently compare the two by speaking of the invaluable training for sport one gets out of combat or by claiming, as one famous athletic figure did, that the best combat officers come from the ranks of letter winners in college! Maybe so, but there is a discrepancy. Competition in modern war holds no place of honor for the opponent. He is to be killed by the silent means of a missile or a bomber high overhead in a conspiracy of silence of which Nietzsche would have approved because it gave no hint of its actual aim or purpose.

Games are getting like that. We hold secret practice, we hold secret meetings. We learn to hit 'em hard and where they are weak, and if we don't exploit the other's tender feelings we miss a bet. All this is, as Mencken would say, because we are fatally insecure, so uncertain of the outcome of the game, so fearful that we may lose that we have no honor to display because honor is predicated upon a feeling of absolute security.

But competition can have another quality. It is, after all, not an end in itself but merely a means. Being a means, it must never become so useful as to overshadow the need for developing mutual respect among men. If the very essence of the democratic way is not respect for personality—then what is it? And any device or practice that teaches the young to hate, to spit upon, or to paint his library needs examination to determine whether the means have grown more important than the ends. Competitive sport can be a fine tool for teaching democratic morality, or it can, with equal facility, become destructive of it. To paraphrase Rousseau: those who would treat sport and morality apart will never understand the one or the other.

There are many violent critics of sports and of the vehicle which so often carries sport through the academic portals—the program of physical education. Why does Robert M. Hutchins so tartly oppose any effort to make a learning experience out of these activities? Why would Bestor, or Fadiman, or Mayer hold little respect for the attempt to claim educational virtue for modern physical education? Why does even a blue-chip educational statesman like James Bryant Conant find a place for physical education in the curriculum only because there is allegedly a body-building influence involved somewhere therein?

Could these phenomena possibly have resulted from the most effective effort at self-destruction any group of well-meaning educators have engaged in in this century? It seems actually that there has been a conspiracy *not* to conduct sport programs upon an educational level, *not* to teach seriously the ethical aspects of sports, but to deny the educational implications of physical education in face of a single concentration upon values in exercise alone.

Perhaps it is, in the long run, impossible for people in the field of physical education to deal with more than one value at a time—and, if forced to choose, the value of strength and sweat, being the easiest attainable, will be the most widely advertised.

With such a single value as the only one in view, the impresarios of games are free to conduct them at any level they wish ethically and educationally. As long as the illusory value of "physical fitness" is sought, no other standards need to be met. Neither personal satisfaction, nor social competence nor continuous participation need to be sought. The anti-intellectual has taken over completely.

Perhaps games will never be returned, even in part, to those who play them or to those who see them as instruments for educational development but will remain forever in the hands of the one who gets the best price he can out of the schedule. Perhaps there is no end to the wild distortion of purpose. Consider, for example, the sorry plight of our modern interpretations of "amateurism." If we had any respect for the English language (and for our moral effect upon the young) we would understand clearly that probably only 5 percent of high school and college athletes today are "amateurs" in any decent interpretation of the word. The rank anti-ethic involved constrains the athletic administrator piously to claim amateur status for the subsidized athlete and suggests that there still may be a social or academic stigma to the professional!

In this day of subsidy? What nonsense! Let's face it morally, not in some pseudo-legal "amateur code." A boy or girl who gets as much as a free meal is no longer an amateur but may and usually does remain a splendid gentleman or lady. Let's abandon this immoral make-believe of piety with which we color our concept of "amateur athletics."

Perhaps the academic eyebrow is raised at sport, and its badly named family physical education, because of the internally generated confusion relative to the discerned ends of its efforts. This confusion is patently self-destructive.

For years physical education programs had been moving rather steadily toward accent on the noun. They had been exploring the ways experience in vigorous movement could be used for total development, to recapitulate the culture of our land, to bring the individual into possession of himself and his powers. The exploration was mainly in the area of social and psychological development because these were relatively unexplored fields and the biological virtue of exercise has been well known for years. Exercise is important to life and living. It is here to stay. Only academic fools are oblivious to that.

But what we needed in physical education was full-blown research and clinical experience in the relation of movement to the teaching of ethics and morality, to the improvement of psychological states, and the cultivation of social gain among people and groups. These we need and these we are not getting because of the immoral stand we take of being glad to cultivate the sound body as the babysitter to the sound mind! We must follow the leader, sweat profusely, walk fifty miles, do our push-ups, patronize Vic Tanney and Bonnie Prudden, and thus will our population be made strong. Morally? Psychologically? Ethically? Socially? Or just muscularly? What are the great needs for successful life in our society? What kind of manpower does our society need for its preservation? This is the compelling question from the standpoint of national need, and people in physical education had better have an answer or they will be lost in the oceans of sweat recommended by the muscle-building anti-intellectual.

But who was John Dewey? To refer to him is risky business in today's world of the Far Right and the dynamometer! He once said that "The serious threat to our democracy is not the existence of foreign totalitarian states. It is the existence within our own personal attitudes and within our own institutions of conditions similar to those which have given a victory to external authority, discipline, uniformity, and dependence upon The Leader in foreign countries."[2]

It is within the repudiation of those idols that we will find the ultimate and eternal strength of free men in a free society. The individual to be educated is a social individual. He lives not alone as a recluse but in a society that is an organic unit of individuals. If we eliminate this social factor we are left with only a pulsating mass of protoplasm sans direction, sans purpose, sans reason for being.

No wonder Hutchins and his group snobbishly advise parents to avoid colleges where physical education is required. He knows that as likely as not the students may be asked to climb ropes ad nauseum or respond seriously to the psuedo-intellectual "fitness" expert who prepares the tables of "fitness" from dynamometers and rope climbs. No wonder. This sort of thing has about the same relation to the educational program as fertilizing the soil with worms does to raising flowers. It may have a part to play but it is a small one and a dubious one at that!

What we in physical education must come soon to understand is that no one, but no one, will take us seriously until we begin to take ourselves seriously and become truly intelligent about exploring the contribution that the world of sports, games, and dance can have to the *education* of man.

Can this world have a bearing upon the Christian ethic? Or any other ethic? Is it to be taken seriously as a means by which the accepted moral standards of the group are to be passed on? Can it be an effective experience in the enrichment of judgment about relative values? Can it help in decision making?

Well, it always *has* had a bearing on these things since man first taught the young through the game and the dance. But right now—when we have organized a program we call physical education, brought it into the school, used motor movement as its means and media—we need to get down to the business of teaching the behaviors this society of ours expects if it is to survive. We need to eliminate the casualness of the "Oh, I say Old Boy, that's not done" approach. We need to get serious about a search for our *total* potential, not merely our muscular.

This country is not going to be saved—or destroyed—by muscle, but by the quality of its moral fibre. What greater challenge can programs of physical education rise to meet?

NOTES

---

1. Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Knopf, 1963).
2. John Dewey, *Freedom and Culture* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939).

The Discovery of Personal Values

It can be assumed without much dispute that all of you have an interest of one kind or another in sport, games, and perhaps dance. Either you play yourselves, or you teach others to play, or you are planning to teach these activities. So we can assume that you must believe them worthwhile or you would not be spending your time in this sort of thing, and I daresay, you would resist any effort to abolish these things as a part of the experience of a college woman. Because you have some feeling about their importance in the life of a college girl, I often wonder, wherein lies this value? Is this merely a pleasant sort of thing to do to while away one's time between the more important academic pursuits of the college classes? Is it merely, or are they merely, prime sources of fun in which you can engage when there is nothing else to do—something to occupy, in a pleasurable way, the leisure hours? Perhaps there are some who view participation as being good for one physiologically. Then there are those who see successful participation in these kinds of activities as a status symbol. The question we might raise, however, is whether or not participation in the games, sports, and dance normally found in college life has any real bearing upon the fiber of the personality in the making, upon the woman, upon the total human being.

Personally, I prefer to think that it does. Let us build a case and see if we can find out just what sort of values might be derived from such participation.

Abstracted and adapted from an address delivered to the Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, April 10, 1963.

There is a wealth of evidence to support the idea that the human is a living entity, with biological goals very much the same as mental or behavioral goals. The famous Edward Sinnott, in a brilliant book entitled *The Biology of the Spirit*, makes it clear to us that goal seeking is characteristic of the entire organism and not just the spiritual or emotional or intellectual facets of life. Sinnott's point is that goal seeking is the *basic* characteristic of *all* of life, that body and mind are but two aspects of a fundamental unity which seeks goals. We are organisms in total, not simply mixtures of compounds, but a living, total architecture, no part of which is understandable except in relation to the whole. It is quite impossible and unreasonable to view ourselves as persons enjoying an emotional life unrelated to all other aspects of our being. It is quite unacceptable, in Sinnott's view, to consider the intellectual life as something quite different from one's physical life. Sinnott is trying to tell us that we do not exist at all in terms of these smaller parts—these fragmented areas of living function or of living protoplasm. He is saying that the physical and the mental, the emotional and the intellectual and the spiritual, are merely aspects of a totality, and they are all one and the same thing. He is saying that the expression of all of these aspects, united as they are together, is one of goal seeking. Whatever experiences we have—whether they be on the playfield or the swimming pool or in the library or in the laboratory—leave us marked. No experience leaves us unmarked. Thus, when we play and play hard, we may have a physiological return in terms of muscular strength or perspiration. But that physiological return is *only part* of the total return, *only part* of what happened to us as we played that game of hockey or swam that race. There is no behavior unrelated to what we truly are or to what we truly are becoming. We become what we live, and we live what we are.

Sport has for too long been shrugged off as merely a pleasant enterprise but not really related to some of the more recognized, formative influences in our lives—like Sunday school, for example, or like reading poetry, or reading a great play like *Cyrano*, or taking a very serious course in philosophy in college. We haven't particularly thought of sport in that rubric. And yet, the evidence places such participation as central to the total development of the individual.

From the earliest days, the influence of play has been a significant influence upon our development. It is in the field of play that we first learned the rudiments of the philosophical background of personal behavior as it relates to ethical behavior or ethical judgments. We first learned the meaning of "no fair" or "I dare you" or "you're chicken," and we reacted, as little children, to those commands or characterizations as the beginning of our total reactions to the challenges of modern life. One imagines the bravery of a little Girl Scout as she plays a game of capture-the-flag or prisoner's base. She thrills with the excitement of it all and does not merely react in terms that we can use to segment her reactions as emotional or physical or intellectual. At her age, there simply is no such segmentation. She experiences success or failure, excitement or boredom, and she identifies the value as pleasurable, satisfying, boring, or disagreeable. She thus seeks more or avoids future such experiences.

The Educational Policies Commission a few years ago challenged us all to see ways to cultivate what it called moral and spiritual values in schools and it presented these values in decalogue form.[1] It was a powerful challenge to educators in any field and particularly, I think, to physical educators because of the potential wealth of opportunity for the physical educator to cultivate such values.

The Commission cited human personality as the basic value. Physical education responds by preparing its teachers to be sensitive to individual differences in constructing programs for children, renouncing a former practice of selecting mass activities regardless of their relevance and expecting all to conform to the single pattern. Modern physical education sees its activities as means to ends, and the ends are the welfare and well-being of the children. The child of misfortune, the handicapped, the hypersensitive, the bashful, the maladjusted, the dub become worthy of as much attention as the skilled, the fortunate, the star. Physical education provides for all, because the enrichment of personality is supreme *regardless of the quality of the performance*.

Perhaps, as another value, we seek to be self-directed. We do not like always to be told what to do. Living as free people in a free society, we come to the idea that we would like to decide a few things for ourselves. We liked to cast off the supervisory antics of our parents when we were growing up, to decide for ourselves what to do in almost any situation. When a father asks a little boy, "Do you want me to help you figure that out?" he says, "No, I will do it." In this field of ours when someone begins to tell us what to dance or how to play a game, we sometimes like to say, no, let me figure this out for myself. This value is important. It is the value of self-direction, of developing independence.

We seek beauty, as another one of these values. We define beauty as whatever is in harmony with life, something that gives us no pain, is pleasurable, to which we react with inner excitement and a sort of absolute exultation—a choreography well danced or a dive well executed or a beautiful horse or a beautiful painting we have done. Beauty is a value unmatched. We seek such values.

Then there is the simple value of fun. So much of life can be, if we make it that way, dull and uninspiring and boring. Thus, when sport, with its moments of happiness and fun and joy and exultation, enters our life, it becomes an important value and ought not to be spoiled by the solemnity that so many people bring to it.

Then there is the value of a self-developed bearing. I remember a little girl who was the victim of some religious persecution that brought her to the point of tears. She was a bit different from some of the other girls in her community. But through the simple medium of a game of volleyball, at which she became expert, she found her place, her status. The other girls in the group, unthinking though they might have been, dropped off their prejudice against this one and accepted her as one of them. I remember the fat little boy who was jeered at, not happy with his architecture, who learned to do the forward roll and they cheered him when he accomplished it. He achieved his own particular niche of dignity through the simple activities of the playfield or the gymnasium. And then there was the lad who had come to the program afraid of the water. But a careful instructor took him in hand and taught him how to swim. As a result, the lad went to the instructor at the end of the term and said, "Thank you. I'm glad you taught me to swim, because now, by golly, I can fish!" The instructor knew that this feeling of satisfaction, of achievement, meant something to him, because the boy was blind, and he couldn't fish from a boat until he could swim.

Then there is the value of being able to make a decision. What to do—to do something right or something wrong, to do something sporting or something mean.

The Commission held that if the individual personality is supreme, each person should feel responsible for the consequence of his or her own conduct. Children play volleyball. In that game one who inadvertently touches the net while making a shot calls a foul upon himself. There are some who think such behavior remarkable. In this day and age why not get away with as much as possible? Yet morality is not a question of being caught at cheating. To teach children in games to tell the truth, to accept responsibility, to call the penalties themselves, and not to evade—such teaching will make the physical education experience a moral force.

If the individual personality is supreme, institutional arrangements, the Commission said, are the servants of mankind. This means that administration in physical education—the rules and regulations, the schemes for attendance taking, the little leagues and organizations, the clubs and groups—exist not as ends in themselves but only to serve the child and the group. The rule is but a point of departure. In conflict with human value, the rule, the administrative device, the arbitrary authority gives way. Only thus can we see the human personality in its hallowed perspective as superior to all institutional organization. Ours is a moral culture. Thus, administrative practice in physical education must, to be a true part of this sort of value system, be responsive to human need.

Mutual consent is better than violence. Children can be taught to talk over their disputes rather than fight over them. The vision of 11 adolescents standing belligerently over the prostrate form of the twelfth, whom they had just kicked into insensibility, is a reminder of the cruelty visited upon human personality when violence flares. The prostrate one merely wanted to go swimming in a public pool, but the mob said no. Possibly, if we could teach a concept of morality through physical education, we could deal more successfully with the wrangles, bickerings, arguments, and fights that have reduced some play experiences to the most unpleasant parts of the day. Can the Golden Rule be applied in play? Surely, but it must become a value of more worth than the sheer cold record of the score.

The Commission urges devotion to truth. Did the player step out of the court or did he not? Were you tagged or weren't you? Is it your turn or not? Did you score three runs that inning or four? Did you touch the net in that last volley or didn't you? What conceivable pressures are there on the field or court that make it necessary to condone the lie, the deception? If truth is desirable, then the multitude of chances for its expression in play must be utilized. There will be those who will debate its application anywhere in life. But if "the human mind is to be liberated by access to information and opinion," surely no stake in all of physical education, including the great college athletic contests, is worth condoning the distortion of truth and confusing or deceiving the human mind.

The physical education experience presents abundant opportunity for recognition and acceptance of truth both in its quantitative form (who won?) and in its qualitative aspects (did we play well?). It is, or at least it should be, hard to evade the truth on the field of play.

Excellence in character and creative ability should be fostered, says the Commission. Physical education responds by worshiping not mediocrity but the beauty and skill of the top performance, by encouraging a child to do his best and expecting the best he has. It fosters excellence and creativity in dance, in games, and in behavior.

All persons are to be judged by the same moral standards. There can be no special privilege in modern physical education. The same set of standards applies to the skilled and to the dub. The opportunity to teach such application is spectacularly real on the playfield. Special privilege of the strong, or the big, or the "home team," or for the excellent is unthinkable in a physical education experience devoted to moral values. What goes for one goes for all, and not to cheat at games becomes a primary lesson. And *that* has as much chance of transferring to other life situations as any other precept learned in any other context.

If individual personality is supreme, the concept of brotherhood should take precedence over selfish interests. Sport in particular and physical education classes in general are excellent places in which to learn lessons in group acceptance. Special and unearned privilege assumed for any reason is wholly unacceptable where people play.

Each person should have the greatest possible opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. Physical education responds by conducting a program where the elemental satisfactions may be had, where success and acclaim are more prevalent than frustration and obscurity. It believes that each student can achieve success according to his own abilities, as he measures himself against discernible standards, and thus through his own efforts attains happiness. It offers joy, fun, contentment, pleasure. It hopes to avoid situations that provoke anger, resentment, or humiliation. Its activities are conducted in an atmosphere of friendly rivalry in which values are derived from the game and not from the anguish of a humiliated opponent.

Last, the Commission suggested that if individual personality is supreme, each person should be offered the emotional and spiritual experiences that transcend the materialistic aspects of life. Physical education can offer such experiences. It can bring to children the meaning of beauty as they dance their way through a colorful operetta, of joy as they thrill to the excitement of a relay, of the satisfaction of self-realization when they achieve the stunt they thought they could not do, of the confident feeling of courage well placed when they bravely correct an injustice in face of popular odds on the playground.

There is also the value we do not always note in our busy life of games and sport. We sometimes find people who just like to be quiet. They just like to sit at the edge of the sea or under the tree, dangling a line, maybe, where they can simply relax and, thus, grow in a sense of understanding of the total world in which they live.

All that I have just said is why we speak of the games and participation in sport and dance as media. Because such participation allows so much to develop in the human personality. I have always wanted to be somewhere near a vast playground, where perhaps a thousand people were participating on a sunny Saturday afternoon. I could see over there a softball game going on and someone successfully stealing second base. And over there, the horseshoe pitchers where someone had just topped a ringer. And over there, the swimming pool where many people were playing and having a marvelous time, just splashing around in the water. And, down the line a little bit, some children playing a rather elementary game and screaming and screeching in their excitement. And then, over there perhaps, on the far side of the playground, the horseback riders, just jogging along and enjoying an afternoon on their favorite mare. And then, coming out of the woods perhaps, would be the hunters, or perhaps going into the next field would be a group of people with a soccer ball ready to engage in that exciting game. And then, across the way, in my imagination, I would see the ice-skaters, racing up and down the ice, chasing a puck in that fascinating game of ice hockey. Double that, triple that imagery—make it 5,000 people, make it 10,000 people, make it an unlimited number of people participating in the activities in which you and I have some interest. You would see the strategies, the behaviors, the exercise, the physiology, the heartbeat, the sorrows, the choices. You would see an appreciation of beauty, behavior. Because, all of these things involve all of the reactions of which the human being is capable. It is a fascinating mixture of motor experience and thoughtful analysis; of reflection and exciting movement; of sight, sound, and feeling; of exultation and sorrow; of greed, maybe, and anger; of humility and confidence; of fun and joy of learning about life. It must be clear that skill and talent and physiology are simply not enough. Neither is the scoreboard nor the gold medal. Because these activities assume their greatest dignity and importance when what we call the heart and the mind are lifted equally and at once by the creative union of perception and grace. All of this represents our contribution to the human spirit.

It is within such simple experiences as these that spiritual virtue is compounded. A child is not born with a full-blown set of values. He comes into them by living the daily incidents that have value overtones. His life on the playground, in the gymnasium, in the pool, and with teams or groups or a companion is rich with opportunities for cultivating these values. If the program of physical education does not recognize its potential influence, if it does not make the effort to teach personal values as strenuously as it teaches skill, it misses its greatest opportunity.

It presents a significant opportunity to go beyond the "physical" or the skill. But the important thing to realize is that forever and a day these values *have* been learned and are being learned in *these situations!* Whether anyone recognizes them or gives credence to their presence, they are there as an inescapable and indigenous element in the physical education experience. It is part of our racial heritage—part of our culture, part of our way of teaching and learning. John M. Trump recently gave us "A New Look At Teaching Moral and Spiritual Values."[2] He suggested *ways*. He provided book lists. The only thing he did not do was add the gymnasium and the playfield as classrooms or laboratories where this sort of human development can—and does—take place. The possibilities are as real in these situations—perhaps even more real—to live personal values in the physical experience than in most other places.

To sum it all up, the physical education experience, properly provided, is an educational one. It seeks to educate in the elements of personal development, self-direction, compatibility with group, and adaptation to national ideals. It can do no less and remain within the educational heritage. It seeks strength and good health as the means useful in attaining those crucially important social goals. Strength without a declared and socially acceptable usage may easily be dangerous to the society we try so valiantly to preserve. "Human" values are golden in our moral society. Nothing may be taught on the playfield or elsewhere that subverts the best of those values.

NOTES

1. Educational Policies Commission, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1951).
2. John M. Trump, "A New Look at Teaching Moral and Spiritual Values," *Ohio's Schools* 41, no. 9, Dec. 1963, p. 12.

Physical Education As a Rich Experience

The physical educator seeks to make changes for the better in human personality. Our gymnasiums and playfields are our laboratories. We hope the experience our people have within our classes will be a pleasant one, a constructive one, one that will draw them to physical education rather than repel them from further participation. We hope the experience they have with physical education will mean something to them for a long time. We hope the experience they have with us will be a rich one. We hope it will not be boring or meaningless or harmful or stupid. So to provide some guidelines as to the nature of a rich experience, let me propose these few characteristics of what a rich experience might be. A learned professor by the name of Edgar Dale once wrote an essay on the meaning of a rich experience. I shall paraphrase some of his remarks and perhaps amplify them in terms of physical education.

A rich experience will have a quality of novelty about it, of newness, of freshness—a sort of pleasant shock of discovery. To us this means that we might well plan, rather frequently, some new things to do, new games, new dances, perhaps even new freedoms, making choices, maybe perhaps new clothes and new colors, new anything. We ought not to bore students with the same old exercises day after day. Break up the routine. Let us even knock off participation in activity for two or three weeks and read something about sports or dance, do something different—show movies, take field trips, argue a point. The daily period over and over may very well be, in some instances, our albatross—it becomes too frequently a deadly, dull, and boring experience. A rich experience will be something wonderful perhaps because it's something new.

A rich experience will have an emotional tone to it—something to get excited about, like Brahms' First, something that will make us stand and cheer and make us happy, something exciting like a game of hockey, or diving or skiing or sailing, something that had the excitement of when we first played hide-and-go-seek, something like figure-skating or the overnight hike. There is no particular point in our getting so blasé about our teaching in physical education as not to get excited. Excitement is very significant.

A rich experience tells us something about ourselves. It involves an element of self-discovery, perhaps through achievement. "I made it," becomes an important cry of exultation: the time we won our Junior Lifesaving emblem, or we got our first hit in a softball game, or maybe we swam from here to the rock offshore, or maybe we did a good backup job in football or soccer that brought commendation, and thus we, in the quiet moments of our own life at home, recognized something about ourselves that we hadn't discovered before. There perhaps is something significant about the development of our self-image that involves pride.

A rich experience is something that leads to other experiences. We become interested in following this thing up: we learned to dance, perhaps in a physical education class, and that took us to a concert because we wanted more; we saw a movie or a television show involving Olympic skiing, and that took us out to the slopes; we may have seen a soccer match from England, and that encouraged us to go to England; maybe we had our first camping experience, and that led us on to a lifetime of enjoyment in the out-of-doors. Unfortunately, there are so many activities recommended to us in physical education that seem to have no future to them. They are dull; they lead us not into anything that would be significant in our lifetime. These would hardly be called rich experiences.

A rich experience involves us wholly—our intellect, our judgment—gives us an opportunity for decision making. We do not want to do something over and over just because someone tells us to all the time. We do not want to do the same old drills or the same old boring activities of childhood. We want something fitting our intellectual and emotional development. We do not always want to have to get "physical" results. We want results in a broader form of intellectualism. It is difficult to evaluate this kind of experience; it is difficult to count or to measure or to test for it—but it is there.

I suggest that the rich experience will lead to other experiences in this same vein. If students like what they learn from us, they will go on to be lifetime participants in something. There are too many people who find physical education a terminal experience. When they are finally released from the requirement, they give away their sneakers! What a pity! What a pity we did not whet their appetites for further exploration of *something*—fishing, camping, climbing, skiing, boating, *anything*! A rich experience leads to a lifetime of exhilarating participation, to self-realization, to achievement—not just as a child, but as an adult; not just to record establishment but to the deeper form of self-fulfillment; and not just as a school girl but as a mother of 50 years. We are talking about physical education in which in the rich experience people learn, become educated, learn to direct themselves, learn to become self-contained and no longer dependent upon the arrogance of the drillmaster or the coach who counts the cadence and tells us which muscles to stretch, which movements to make, and when.

Does Sport Have a Culture of Its Own?

Let us start out by discovering what I mean by sport and by culture. By sport I mean the myriad variety of sports as we see them in our society. I am not just talking about competitive, organized sport. I mean sport in its broadest terms—everything from highly organized professional football or the games of the National Basketball Association or Stanley Cup competition, everything from the sport of white water canoeing down the Penobscot or Snake Rivers, everything from pick-up basketball in the backyard to the state championships, from Saturday afternoon foursomes to the Masters, from synchronized swimming to swimming on the family picnic, from hunting moose in Hudson Bay to squirrels in Ohio—the whole range. I am asking whether all of that sport together has a common culture of its own or fits into the culture of the people who participate. That is the big double question. Does sport stand alone as something unique in society or does it fit into and mirror our way of living?

What do we mean by culture? I have said it may be described as our way of living, the way we act toward each other, the way we behave, what we believe in, the standards we hold to, the things we hold dear and of good report. It involves a general quality of our total social and political systems.

Abstracted from an address delivered at the Texas State Convention on November 30, 1962, and at the 16th Biennial Convention of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation at Frederictown, New Brunswick, June 23, 1965.

Does sport as we know it fit our way of life or is it something apart from it, with its own beliefs, its own ways of behaving, its own standards? There is speculation about the effect of wars, scandals in government, alteration in moral codes, bribery, "payolas," and resignations upon the values and standards of our population—especially upon our youth. Are we headed downward—or upward—morally and spiritually? Or are we merely creating a new set of values to fit our jungle-like atomic age? It is an age in which truth seems not to be in us, and the criteria by which we judge the social novelty of an act is epitomized by those who say "I didn't do anything anyone else wouldn't do—I just got caught at it!" The companion of that whimsical and vicious bit, in sport, is "What difference does it make what happened? We won didn't we?"

What does such a state of affairs mean to us in the conduct of sport in the schools and colleges of this country? If it is possible to link the sports program to the development of moral and spiritual fiber in the nation, we must recognize that the basic element of our society in democratic America—that is, the basic propositions upon which we construct our way of life—are couched in moral and philosophical terms. There have been many statements published to that effect in recent years, one of the most important of which is a paperback entitled *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*, published in 1951 by the Educational Policies Commission of the NEA. The Commission makes it clear that the core of our society is the human being, and the structure of his community is a moral system operating through material phenomena. Thus, the analysis, examination, preservation, and perpetuation of our moral and spiritual codes—those values that exalt and refine life—is the principal business of us all today. It remains the great and continuing purpose of education. Unless sport in particular, and physical education in general, are to be constructed as programs unrelated to the social and moral culture of our people at large, we must pay heed to the specifics of the moral code and do what we can to operate our sports programs in their light.

It would be easy to ignore the basic tenets of our society and go our merry way in pursuit of skill, excellence, victory, and the other goals so dominant in athletics—that is, to ignore the potentialities of the field of sport and let the ministers and educators fret about the moral values. But we cannot do it. We in sport have accepted the development of the whole person as our field of operation. We say repeatedly that participation in sport is good for the total girl or the total boy. We have a relation to behavior, to sportsmanship, to fair play, to ethics. We have recoiled from the accusation that we are merely muscle builders. We have rejected the cult of muscle, and we have accepted the responsibility for the development of the whole individual. To deal with this individual, as an individual and in every aspect of his development, we must enrich his body of values as well as the value of his body.

Of what body of values are we speaking? In spite of the melting-pot nature of our society and in spite of the sometime conflict between pragmatism and orthodoxy, we *have* evolved some values which our people accept. These are the values set forth so clearly and so brilliantly by the Educational Policies Commission.

A reading of those specifics presents an inescapable challenge to all of us interested in athletics. They state that the *basic* moral and spiritual value in American life is the supreme importance of the individual personality. They make it clear that if individual personality is supreme, each person should feel responsible for the consequences of his own conduct. They make it clear that if individual personality is supreme, institutional arrangements—our rules and conferences and leagues—are the servants and not the masters. They make it clear that if individual personality is supreme, mutual consent is better than violence; that excellence in mind, character, and creative ability should be fostered. They echo our concept of democratic equality by suggesting that if individual personality is supreme, all persons should be judged by the same moral standards. The concept of brotherhood should take precedence over selfish interests. Furthermore, each person should have the greatest possible opportunity for the pursuit of happiness, provided only that such activity does not substantially interfere with similar opportunities for others. And last, if the individual personality is supreme, each person should be offered the emotional and spiritual experiences that transcend the materialistic aspects of life.

Is the development of such values beyond the scope of athletic competition? Are those of us in charge of sport unconcerned about the development of such values?

In my judgment, we are inescapably involved, and if we do not feel that involvement, we are guilty of adherence to a segmented development in which we are concerned only with physical values. If we teach contrary to those values, we then are subversive of the best moral values of our society. Therefore, we *must* teach these values. We cannot escape them.

Is it ethical for us to condone acts and attitudes of poor sportsmanship in sports at *any* level? There are some who fear that school and college sport are seriously menaced and facing degradation in the name of victory, or commercialism, or both. Does the cynical cry of the victor—"But we won, didn't we?"—erase all ethical or moral responsibility for *how* we won or at what *cost* to the moral fiber of the participants?

There is probably no field in all of education so replete with situations involving ethical behavior. Does one "steal the show" in the dance recital by the gesture or expression at the right (or wrong) time? Does one lie to the referee, falsify the weight, move the ball, touch the net but fail to acknowledge it? Does one use the hands illegally or do any one of a hundred available things not in the spirit of the game?

There is grave danger that American games are being seriously degraded. The influence of professional sport is not particularly uplifting, especially ice hockey with its brutal personal attacks and fighting among players. The gold rush is on, and ''nice guys finish last.'' Thankfully one still can see a really hot contest between two high school or college basketball teams played by gentlemen (or ladies) holding each other in respect and friendship. But too often the display of rudeness toward opponents and officials goes beyond all reasonable bounds—and there are about as many ''witches'' among the girls and women as there are ''hotheads'' among the boys and men.

The fist fight, the argument, the display of temper, the ''show-boating,'' the alibi, the accusation, the outright cheating, the underhanded practice, the biased official, the ''getting away with anything you can''—these are marks of degradation. How can we stem this tide? By sighing for the good old days? By staying home? Or by speaking out? By *teaching* in our physical education classes what ethical behavior is? Or would that take too much time from our ''conditioning'' exercises?

We *can* teach ethical values in our classes. But *should* we try? Why not leave those values to Sunday school or athletic banquets or the sports writers?

There is no clear-cut answer to the question, so let us begin with a premise that sport in any or all of its forms can and should reflect the best of our way of life, but that it also can, with thoughtless and subversive administration, become destructive of it. I am going to suggest that because some 90 percent of our population at some time in their life has participated in sport of one kind or another, that it is no idle, inconsequential phenomenon and that it does have something to do with our national culture.

In the first place, sport—participation in it or witnessing it—is important to young and old. It does something to us. It leaves its mark. It is an educational experience. We learn from it and through it and by it. In the second place, the situations that arise within it and from it are, for the teacher of physical education, glorious opportunities for teaching the social behaviors expected in our culture. There is a continuous interplay of personality, a continuous opportunity to learn about each other and about the group and about the large aspects of society. The situation presents a golden opportunity for the teacher who knows what sort of phenomenon he is dealing with. Sport can be a powerful force, one way or another.

Sport is important and must be preserved as a reflection of the best in our life, as a showcase of our beliefs, as a rewarding experience in human relations. It must not be limited only as a factor in the economic growth of our industry or merely as a pleasant recreational pastime of no social significance. Worse yet, it must not be degraded into internecine warfare with all the brutalities of the jungle, all the slashing, fighting, ego-centered quarrels of uncivilized people. It needs protection against its enemies and, principally, protection from its friends.

We are confused about it. We do not know, for example, whether to preserve the 19th-century conception of amateurism or to allow the economic factor of commercialism to enter into our contests. We know that the latter is inevitable. But we are having difficulty facing the inescapable responsibility of casting a new form of equalizing competition between groups. Amateur sports, as we knew them in the 19th and early 20th centuries, will disappear. We must somehow develop another way of equalizing competition, if that is our objective.

We are confused because we do not know whether sports have a place in school or college. In some areas, particularly in New England, for example, participation in sport carries no academic respectability whatsoever. It has no bearing upon the accumulation of academic credits or the winning of a degree. It happens to be considered a pleasant extracurricular enterprise. In other places, on the other hand, it carries full academic standing. Which is the better way to handle sport?

We are confused because we do not know exactly who should set the standards for conduct in sports or to what lengths any person or team or group is entitled to go in order to win. We do know that sport can be fun, like Saturday afternoon golf or tennis, or it can be as disgusting as we find it sometimes when we go to high school or college basketball games and are overwhelmed by the loud, raucous jeers and boos. Sport can be as adventuresome as a wilderness canoe trip or as nerve-wracking as a hockey game. It can be as beautiful as a regatta or as hideous as boxing. It can be hard but politely fought, or it can be frightening and as devastating as a War of Roses or professional ice hockey.

We are not sure yet at what age participation in sport should commence or just what privileges should be extended to girls and women who want to participate in organized athletics. We are not quite sure whether "winning is all there is" or whether there is much more to participation than the search for the medal or the trophy.

To remove this confusion we must have certain criteria. Let me suggest four or five that seem basic to the cultural patterns under which we live.

First, we have believed since the beginning of this country that each person is entitled to an opportunity to progress, to become educated, to live. We call it equality of opportunity, and we have constructed our great educational systems upon that cultural pattern. It is important to us. To extend that into every aspect of our lives—from education to housing to economic opportunity to protection to health opportunities—becomes one of our basic philosophical shibboleths with which we wage our peaceful coexistence.

Second, we believe distinctly in what LaPierre and others have described as the Freudian ethic, which involves the abandonment of blind allegiance to authority and substitutes for it the assertion of the right of the individual to make decisions. Thus, we in physical education or in sport need to emphasize that the decision to go "out" or to go along with the practice of the group belongs to the individual placed in that situation. We have rejected the authoritarian type of activity in physical education precisely because we have found it did not assume any compatibility with the right of the individual to make up his own mind, to arrive at his own decision, to do what he thinks is best, to participate as he sees fit. We have established certain values as central as a result of the influence of some of our forefathers, such as Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, who have helped us to establish the idea that individual personality is the supreme value in a democracy. That has been clearly stated by the Educational Policies Commission and by many of our great leaders in education. And thus, the central criterion for judging value is how it affects the individual. The central purpose of any social unit is to further his best interests. How does sport embrace that particular idea? How does the everyday administration of everything from Little League baseball or hockey to college and high school sports for girls and boys measure up to that particular standard which is basic to our society? Does sport as you know it remain within that framework?

Furthermore, our society is essentially a moral society. Many have suggested that the essential force that makes things go has been a system of values based upon the old-fashioned term, a system of morals. The Declaration of Independence made that clear when it embraced the pursuit of happiness as one of our objectives. The Educational Policies Commission makes that clear when it urges us to seek as one of our basic outcomes of an educational system a devotion to truth. What does sport have to do with that? In the very beginning, in childhood sports, we teach youngsters not to cheat, to be fair in their play. As we go into the more highly organized sports, we have rules to be observed, and cheating is frowned upon.

Next, it should be clear, as President Pusey of Harvard once put it, that the significant struggle between good and evil is not in society but in the individual. The Educational Policies Commission insisted, echoing that point of view, that every individual be responsible for the consequences of his own conduct: that every individual learn to stand up and be counted. No excuse, because the crowd does it, is valid. There is no way we can justifiably and rightfully place the blame for our conduct upon the system under which we operate. The institution cannot be substituted for the individual. There is no point in saying that everybody does it and therefore it is okay for me. There is no way we can possibly escape the responsibility for the character and quality of our own conduct.

Then we believe that achievement is a *means* and not an end. It is not how high you can jump but what kind of a person you are because you jump that high. It is not a question of how fast our Olympic athletes can run or what the score is in a tennis match or by what margin we won a championship. It is not a question of the quantitative distance or time. It is a question of what happened to the individual who participated as a result of that participation. Participation is a means by which we develop the personal qualities in the given individual. Batting averages are of no account until we know what kind of person was produced as a result of that batting average. I have always liked the conception of President Bixler of Colby College as to the simple and basic purpose of an education, which he describes as "to teach the individual to distinguish between the good and the beautiful and the cheap and the shoddy."

Can we do something of that sort through sport? I am perfectly sure we can.

The development of sport throughout our land in terms of the wide range of its variety is a clear demonstration of what we mean by equality of opportunity. We seem to be progressing to the point where we are recognizing that sport is for everyone. Through the development of our splendid recreational systems of our cities and states; the development of our state, county, and national parks; the development of our programs of all sorts from elementary school through college and into adult life, we seem to grasp the idea that everyone is entitled to a sport. We have lowered barriers among races and ages and sexes. We are gradually moving to the point where there is no person living who needs to come into this world feeling that he is barred or does not have access to a sport of his choosing. That effort must be continued so that sport does become a living, vibrant manifestation of equality of opportunity.

We do see sport as a prestige field. We applaud achievement. We give honor to our stars. Yet we must never allow sport to fall into the category of belonging only to the social or athletic aristocracy. We have done our best to discard the terms *major* and *minor* in describing sports in school or college. We recognize that what is minor for one is major for another and vice versa. The only criterion by which we judge the value of a sport is what it means to the individual who participates. We believe that we can teach a distinction of the good and the beautiful from the cheap and the shoddy, by developing appreciation of friendships, camaraderie, the development of all the virtues to be found in the clean, healthy play of young people. What an opportunity it is to develop friendships, and how sad it is when people conduct sport in such a way that the competitors never see each other, never develop the friendships potentially there.

But I presume that, like all good things in life, sport must be protected from its friends as well as from its enemies. There are those who would remove sport from our culture of a democratic nation and develop for it a culture of its own or, worse yet, affiliate sport with some alien or heathen culture.

It is not difficult to identify some of these destructive influences now in some of our sports programs. Let me mention a few of them. We seem to be developing a cult of personality. We recognize the temptation for anyone who is successful in sport to be a "colorful" player, to be a show-off, to be good copy for the media. And those people become the standard for others. They cover their weakness with their idiosyncrasies and their individual peculiarities. They use sport merely as a way to satisfy their insatiable appetite for public notice. I think, for example, of the ranting and raving of the coaches we sometimes see on the sidelines in competitive sport, those who wear peculiar clothes, calling attention of the crowd to them. In contrast are those coaches who sit quietly on the sidelines allowing the players and the officials to conduct the game. I am thinking of some of our tennis players who seem to be flagrantly impolite and who seem to want to allow their personality to dominate and to color not only their performance but the performances of others. The flamboyant pitcher in a baseball game, the slashing, cruel, offensive ice-hockey player, the curious football player who for one reason or another is not satisfied to let his play speak for himself but wants to develop the idea that he himself is the game. He loves to be called "Mr. Football." He looks on his sport as show biz.

Then there is the cult of the impersonal. There are those who conduct sports as if they are really not engaged in by human beings but by inanimate or animalistic objects. The football coach deplores the fact that he doesn't have "the horses." Or he says, "I don't care how you do it, just get it done." Or he suggests that the score is the only thing that counts and that no matter how we won, "We won, didn't we?" Sport thus becomes an experience in the impersonal, and the players become a faceless hoard—chattel to be used in the accomplishment of any purpose, regardless of its relation to the developing personality participating in it.

There is also the cult of violence. We have seen a great deal of that lately. The riots in our basketball games because of the violence, both oral and physical, which seemed to be expected and taken for granted in some sports. There seems to be little attention paid in some sports to teaching either sportsmanship or good manners or plain country hospitality. I dislike the mean things we sometimes do—like tearing off the chin strap in football and hiding it in order to get time out, or kicking the ball away from the second baseman, or moving in tennis to distract the one who is serving or drawing the other team offside in order to get an advantage, or intentional fouling in basketball. There are dozens of little things we do in order, by one means or another, to achieve the victory.

Then there is the cult of the immoral, of pretense, of something less than truth. One loses a ball in a golf match and blames the imperfect rough. One intentionally misses a call in tennis. One does not adhere to an amateur rule. One deliberately cheats or gets an undeserved advantage.

We see also the cult of injustice. The best example was the practice of not so many years ago of the great collegiate athletic association known as the NCAA, in which penalties for infractions of rules were placed upon the wrong people. Whole teams, whole universities and all of the teams representing that university were placed on probation or placed on penalty, when actually the infraction was produced only by one or two or three persons. This was a direct violation of the basic laws upon which our judicial system is based. Unfortunately, injustice works its way in and through many of our athletic institutions.

Last, there is the cult of the solemn and the serious, in which the coaches at a sport event sometimes would have us believe that there is a religious overtone to their activity. They call their players together for a solemn prayer, or they are solemnly interviewed by media representatives and act as if this were not just a game but a test of whether the country itself will survive. Even some of our national organizations feel that anyone who criticizes their administration is desecrating a fundamental institution.

Are we permitting sport to develop a culture all its own, in which certain things are permissible which would not be acceptable in society as a whole? Are we permitting certain practices, certain customs, certain ways of doing things to develop in sport which we would laugh at or hold in ridicule or actually frown upon in society at large? Are we taking our sport heroes too seriously? Are we assuming that to win a championship is much more important than almost anything else in the world? Are we assuming that a successful coach—that is, one whose boys or girls have won a championship—is some sort of a demigod, to be honored and praised and showered with medals and trophies beyond all decency? Have we really developed sport to the point where it is blown clear out of proportion to some of the other activities we carry on in our communities? Has our talent for organizing sport actually taken some of the fun out of it? One shudders, sometimes, when one watches a Little League baseball game, to see how extravagantly serious some of the parents take that game and how abusive they become to their boys or girls when they have lost. Will our greed, our ego needs, ruin sports? Or will they be preserved for all, and become the possession of all of our people who can have fun and the pleasure and the thrill out of participating?

I like the comment from Herbert W. Wind, made years ago, in which he said he was afraid that we were allowing the spirit of sports to go out of sports. He suggested that sports were full of humor and fun; they were spontaneous. They were an experience, perhaps, in making contact with something idealistic in our nature when we were young and when the poet in all of us blossoms wordlessly in a genuinely sporting atmosphere.

If we allow sport to develop a culture of its own, that culture may be a culture of blemish and discord and brutality and violence. It can, however, mirror the brilliance of our own worth. It can mirror the fun and the pleasure that we so desperately want to hold onto in this changing and frightening world.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE in the HPER LEADERS SPEAK series . . .

CONCEPTS AND CONVICTIONS

Del Oberteuffer, an eloquent spokesman throughout his many years of dedication to the achievement of excellence in both physical education and health education, speaks out again to the profession in this volume—sharing his thoughts and feelings on the education of the whole person, mind and body. This is a stimulating collection of articles by a renowned authority in both fields. "In no instance," he says in his preface, "did any audience or any class get less than my best." The contents of this book, recommended for all who are involved in health education and physical education, reflects that emphasis on excellence. 1977.

HPER OMNIBUS

A compilation of ideas, thoughts and beliefs of 16 recipients of the Luther Halsey Gulick Award—the highest honor accorded by AAHPER to its members. Transcribed from the original audiotapes developed as a part of the Alliance's "Tape the Leader" project, they include contributions by Ruth Abernathy, Dorothy S. Ainsworth, Rosalind Cassidy, Elwood Craig Davis, Margaret H'Doubler, Clair V. Langton, William Ralph LaPorte, Mabel Lee, Minnie L. Lynn, Helen Manley, Charles H. McCloy, Jay Bryan Nash, Neils P. Neilson, Julian W. Smith, Arthur H Steinhaus and Jesse Feiring Williams. 1976.

MEMORIES OF A BLOOMER GIRL

Mabel Lee, the "first lady of AAHPER," recounts her early life from the naughty nineties to the roaring twenties, reflecting the patterns of a growing country and an emerging profession—physical education. Bloomers became the symbol of the career she was to follow—beginning with sports and dance as a grade school girl, continuing into high school and college at the turn of the century, followed by two years of professional training, and finally a glimpse at her teaching career in the World War I era. Celeste Ulrich, in her foreword, calls it "a tender, compelling, emotional, revealing, awesome story." 1977.

TO SEEK AND FIND

An intimate look at AAHPER's 1976-77 president, Celeste Ulrich, through a selection of 15 of her speeches over the past decade. Telling it like it is—or should be—in HPER, she's one of the profession's most eloquent spokespersons. Sometimes controversial, always thought-provoking, these selections are must reading for every student and professional in HPER. 1976.

VITAL ISSUES

Here is a series of speeches by Eleanor Metheny, recognized for her contributions in "intellectualizing" the field of physical education. They span 30 eventful years for the profession—1942-1971. Considered controversial and provocative at that time, the speeches reflect the "mood" and trends that were prevalent during those years. Emphasis is on the "whole person" with particular reference to affective, sensory, perceptual, cognitive, symbolic and meaningful aspects of experiences related to physical education. 1977.

For order information and prices, write:

AAHPER Promotion Unit
1201 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036